

**Do College Students Support Multiculturalism and What's behind Their Attitudes:
Demographic, Ideology, Contact, Race Perceptions or University Factors?**

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

Morehead State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Sociology

by

Hideko Asada

December 7, 1998

App-KY
MSU-Thesis
305.80711
A798d

Accepted by the faculty of the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences,
Morehead State University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of
Arts in Sociology degree.

Eric Swank
Director of Thesis

Master's Committee:

Eric Swank, Chair
Constantine A. Hensley
Rebecca A. Hensley

12/7/98
Date

Do College Students Support Multiculturalism and What's behind Their Attitudes:
Demographic, Ideology, Contact, Race Perceptions, or University Factors?

Hideko Asada, M.A.
Morehead State University, 1998

Director of Thesis: Eric Swank

ABSTRACT

In the U.S., the content and style of university classes has produced many controversies. Debates on multiculturalism have produced heated discussion and these arguments have polarized some scholars. The conservative opponents blame multiculturalism as a dividing force and the proponents embrace its liberating potential. However, while these debates brewed, there have been few systematic studies on student attitudes toward multiculturalism. Thus, this research fills a void by carrying out an exploration of the student attitudes toward multiculturalism. And at the same time, this project attempts to reveal the influential factors that shape the attitudes of students.

In extending the literature on student attitudes, this paper will not follow the studies that examine single theory at a time. Instead, this study will include a variety of competing theories. With this inclusive perspective, this study tests five theoretical models.

First and foremost, the study examines the symbolic racism and group conflict theories which are derived from Sears (1988) and Bobo (1988). Moreover, this project also explores the importance of the contact thesis as expressed by Ellison and Powers (1994) and Smith (1994). Also, this project incorporates educational research that identifies the many factors which could impact student perceptions of educational process (Astin 1993; Milem 1994; Pascarella et al. 1996; Springer et al. 1996). Finally, this project integrates some notions of ideological and demographic

factors that are presented by political science and sociological scholars (Alvarez and Brehm 1997; Sidanius, Devereux and Pratto 1991; Kirkpatrick 1993; Seltzer, Frazier and Ricks 1995).

In testing these conceptual schemates, I conducted a survey on the campus of Morehead State University. In employing a mixture of convenience and purposive sampling, this project ended up with 437 cases. After running a multiple regression on the data, the results suggest that Kentuckian students show mild support or neutral attitudes toward multiculturalism. Among the five models, models by Sears, Kinder and Sanders and Bobo explain a considerable amount of variance in the attitudes. In particular, racial resentment has the most influence on student attitudes. However, in the end, the multiple regression reveals that a few of the other 48 variables show some small impacts on the student attitudes.

Accepted by:

Eric Swank, Chair
Constance A. Hendrix
Rebecca D. Kelly

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION: THE MULTICULTURALISM DEBATE-----	1
--	---

CHAPTER 2

MULTICULTURALISM AND THE COLLEGE POPULACE-----	6
--	---

CHAPTER 3

RELEVANT THEORIES AND REVIEWING LITERATURE-----	10-28
Demographic Factors-----	11
Ideological Factors-----	14
Contact with Members of Minority Groups-----	17
Perception of Race Relations in the U.S.-----	18
University Experiences and Situations-----	23

CHAPTER 4: METHODS----- 29-42

Sample-----	29
Sampling Procedure-----	30
Measures-----	32
Dependent Variables:	
Attitudes toward the Goal of Multiculturalism-----	32
Independent Variables: Influential Factors-----	33

CHAPTER 5: RESULTS----- 43-56

Descriptive statistics:	
Attitudes toward the Goal of Multiculturalism-----	43
Explanatory statistics:	
The Factors that Influence Multiculturalism Attitudes-----	45

CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION----- 57

APPENDIX: SURVEY -----	62
------------------------	----

NOTES-----	73
------------	----

REFERENCES-----	74
-----------------	----

*literary reviews
Empirical*

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Items of Dependent Variable Index-----	33
Table 2. Demographic Variables-----	34
Table 3. Ideology Variables-----	35
Table 4. Contact Variables-----	37
Table 5. Race Relation Variables-----	39
Table 6. University Variables-----	42
Table 7. Percent of Dependent Variables Index-----	43
Table 8. Standardized Betas for Regression of Support for Goals of Multiculturalism on Demographic (Model 1) and Ideological (Model 2) Variables-----	47
Table 9. Standardized Betas for Regression of Support for Goals of Multiculturalism on Demographic (Model 1), Ideological (Model 2), Contact (Model 3) and Race Relation (Model 4) Variables-----	51
Table 10. Standardized Betas for Regression of Support for Goals of Multiculturalism-----	56

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION: THE MULTICULTURALISM DEBATE

In the last two decades, the topic of multiculturalism has created many heated debates among intellectuals and the general population. For example, California's Proposition 227, which seeks to end bilingual education, was passed by 61 percent of Californian voters (Facts on File 1998). With a majority backing the bill, this policy reveals how Californian residents want immigrants to immediately assimilate as they try to curtail a bilingual education. Along the same line, multiculturalism is often attacked by the written works of conservatives who consider it as a promotion of minority rights. That is, many conservatives believe that a culturally diverse curriculum hurts White students and destroys the foundation of a classical Western education.

The list of published authors who dislike multiculturalism is long: Allan Bloom, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., E. D. Hirsch, Jr., Lynn V. Cheney, Shelby Steel, Roger Kimball, Dinesh D'Souza, Diane Ravitch, Nathan Glazer, Charles Sykes, Richard Bernstein, George Will, George Gilder, Chester Finn, Jr., Thomas Sowell, and so on (Banks 1994; Giroux 1994; Goldberg 1994; Higham 1993; Jayne 1991; Platt 1992; Seltzer, Frazier and Ricks 1995; Takaki 1993a and b). One reason for the length of this list is that conservative think tanks and organizations finance their research and publicize their polemics. For instance, many of these anti-multiculturalists are supported by organizations such as the National Association of Scholars, the Madison Center, Olin Foundation, Hoover Institute, Heritage Foundation, Scaife Foundation,

and Smith Richardson Foundation (Banks 1994; Giroux 1994; Platt 1992). Among these organizations, the National Association of Scholars (NAS) severely attacks multiculturalism. It is led by a group of professionals who oppose multiculturalism, and publish the journal, *American Question*, which contains articles discussing the conservative backlash on a wide range of issues related to the crisis in universities (Jayne 1991:33). Notably, this group even lends support to political campaigns. For example, the California NAS has added organizing expertise to the ballot initiative that ended affirmative action in California (Chavez 1998). In summarizing their impacts, some professors have argued that the NAS enforces a very serious threat to academic freedom, especially to left-wing intellectuals who attempt to build a more open, democratic, and inclusive academic environment (Burris and Diamond 1991).

A leading individual opponent of multiculturalism, Allan Bloom (1987) argues that the social contract is threatened by the emphasis on ethnicity in multicultural education. In other words, a celebration of diversity is harmful to society because the stress in ethnicity supposedly separates Americans into fractional tribes. E. D. Hirsch, Jr. also dismisses multiculturalism. He insists that multiculturalism interferes with a school's responsibility to ensure children's knowledge of American and Western civilization (1987). Another well-known multiculturalism opponent, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. criticizes multiculturalists as "ethnocentric separatists" who see little in the Western heritage beyond (Schlesinger, Jr. 1992: 123) and also blames the emphasis on ethnicity because "(T)his 'exaggeration' of ethnic difference,...drives ever deeper the awful wedges between

racism” (quoted in Takaki 1993 b: 115). Moreover, he calls diversity a cult of ethnicity that threatens to become a counter-revolution against the original theory of America as one people, a common culture, and a single nation (Schlesinger, Jr. 1992: 15). He claims that Americans to him, are, “individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men” (Schlesinger, Jr. 1992: 138). Here, he also reveals his sexist perception by only determining a race to men, not including women.

Other critics claim to value multiculturalism, but reject its methods of implementation. For instance, Diane Ravitch (1990) claims that she supports the pluralistic perspective, but considers multiculturalism to be a catalyst for introducing conflict among groups. Therefore, she stresses national unity and discourages a specific group identity. In contrast, there are some opponents who attack multiculturalism from a leftist perspective suggesting that multicultural curriculum as reproducing racism (Giroux 1994: 332).

In contrast, historian Ronald Takaki confronts these opponents by arguing that multiculturalism is not a force behind racial and class polarization (Takaki 1993a: 427). He claims that before one talks of division, there must originally be unity. And, most importantly, the U.S. never had a consensus on values to begin with. Moreover, through multiculturalism, students can unlearn the falsehoods of the manifest destiny narratives by including accurate depictions of American subcultures (Takaki 1993a: 426). Thus, Takaki sees multicultural knowledge as a positive force that can revise a distorted notion of a homogeneous America.

In a similar view, Lawrence Levine recognizes multiculturalism as a process

to revise history and change the WASPian definition of the “American identity” (Levine 1996b). Levine argues that U.S. society is fundamentally a heterogeneous mix, so it seems inappropriate to cling onto a Eurocentric notion of the “real American.” He states that multiculturalism recognizes what has been ignored and claims that it is necessary to understand these forgotten histories. Hence multicultural advocates want American histories to be pried from Eurocentric perspectives that ignore the life-worlds and achievements of minority societal members.

Other multiculturalism proponents say that multiculturalism has a transformable trajectory. David Theo Goldberg claims that a multicultural education is not simply a knowledge base, but it is a political artifact that attacks social misconceptions. Moreover, this revision adds a sense of political urgency since cultural criticism can confirm a commitment to social justice. In his words, “resistance must take into account an intervention into social struggle in order to provide equal access to social resources and to transform the dominant power relations which limit this access according to class privilege, race, and gender” (Goldberg 1994: 57-8). He is not only satisfied with stressing differences, but he looks for recognition and understanding of different cultures that can challenge an unjust prevailing order.

Thus, it is clear that many scholars are concerned about the matter of a multicultural education. In light of this debate, this present study will focus on the issues raised by these scholars. However, rather than focusing on this scholarly debate, the study will explore these attitudes of another population. That is, this

paper will look at the college students who are the audience of a multicultural education.

CHAPTER 2

MULTICULTURALISM AND THE COLLEGE POPULACE

Multiculturalism is discussed not only at a primary level of education, but it also provokes heated arguments in the institutions of higher education. At an anecdotal level, people may notice that the friction between the supporters and the opponents of multiculturalism involves college and university students. Moreover, some descriptive studies find that multiculturalism is a sensitive topic among college students. For instance, Levin and Cureton clearly reveal that

“(M)ulticulturalism is a painful subject on campus today. Students do not want to discuss it...This means that students were most troubled about race relations on those campuses in which diverse groups had the greatest opportunity for sustained contact” (Levine and Cureton 1998: 72).

It seems that the merits of multiculturalism are quite salient to college students. Hence, this paper will explore college student attitudes on the issue of multiculturalism.

The literature on multiculturalism contains a number of essays on pedagogy but has few systematic studies on what college students think about these teaching efforts. To fill this gap, this paper examines college students’ attitudes toward multiculturalism. Furthermore, this research has an explanatory tilt since it examines the factors that might influence these attitudes. In other words, the purpose of this thesis is to examine what students think about multiculturalism and what factors might mediate or explain these attitudes.

While earlier studies on the perceptions of multiculturalism and also race-targeted policies tend to test a single theory, this paper will test an array of competing claims. The field of education shows that some college students change their beliefs and attitudes during their college years. Moreover, in the vein of a liberal education, college seems to produce greater racial understandings, openness, tolerance of diversity; and it decreases the adherence to authoritarian, dogmatic and ethnocentric ideas (Astin 1993: 159; Pascarella et al. 1996). Unfortunately, these studies from the educational literature mostly look at the effects of college on students. That is, the studies examine at only the university variables that are associated with the immediate collegiate context. This seems a bit misguided since college student lives are situated in larger social processes that occur outside of the campus. Therefore, this study includes social scientific studies that address factors which rest outside of the standard privy of the university.

As my critique implies, none of the earlier studies simultaneously addressed a comprehensive list of independent variables. Thus, these previous inquiries have led to fragmented and contradictory findings. In overcoming these limitations, the present research incorporates a wide range of theories into several comprehensive models.

At this point, some readers may ask: "Why is multiculturalism worth discussing?" Without a doubt, immigration and demographic changes are leading the U.S. to a greater multiracial configuration. Subsequently, a greater number of citizens and students will come from diverse racial minorities. Thus, if we are not to be in a

state of denial, it is a topic that needs to be discussed. James A. Banks states this position well by arguing that multiculturalism is “to respond more adequately to the needs of ethnic and immigrant groups and to help these groups become more structurally integrated into their societies” (Banks 1994: xvii).

In addition, the last twenty years has seen worsening in race relations. From the 1970s to the present, racial income gaps have widened. When looking at the same occupations, Blacks earn significantly less than Whites. Whites who are professionals, managers, and executives earn \$9,000 more than Blacks with the same occupations. That is “a discrepancy that puts the black-to-white income ratio at 0.75” (Oliver and Shapiro 1997: 118). Adding to the economic polarization has been an increase in hate crimes and large-scale violent racial riots in a variety of locations (Dovidio and Gaertner 1998: 3). Finally, many Whites have joined a backlash against the New Deal and the War on Poverty programs, which have been generally seen to serve minority groups.

In adding to the general necessity of addressing American race relations, this study is also important because it addresses the attitudes of the educative audience. Since students are the recipients of a multicultural education, it seems wise to grasp how students view the situation. In effect, to understand the relative success of a multicultural education, research should determine the extent to which students are receptive to this type of a curriculum.

After determining that this project might help anticipate student reactions to a multicultural education, this paper also has a unique element in the population of

students. The present study extensively focuses on Appalachian college students. Earlier studies have often times only looked at the difference between residents in South and North, but they have ignored the role of a possible subculture of Appalachian values. This is important since students from universities in different geographical areas might be more prone to accept or reject multiculturalism. Therefore, this paper is unique in exploring the ideas of students in a state university located the mid-Atlantic part of Appalachia.

With such a research agenda, this paper addresses two major questions:

- 1) What are the college students' attitudes toward multiculturalism in an Appalachian state university?
- 2) What are the factors that drive these attitudes toward multiculturalism?

In answering these questions, the rest of this thesis will first deliberate the beliefs of some college students, later, the values of certain theoretical formulations will be ascertained through the use of empirical measures and different statistical tools.

CHAPTER 3

RELEVANT THEORIES AND REVIEWING LITERATURE

To begin this theoretical elaboration, I will define the sometimes-confusing term called “multiculturalism.” Catharina R. Simpson defines it as the necessary recognition that we cannot think of culture unless we think of many cultures at the same time (Levine 1996b: 143). In other words, multiculturalism comes to view culture as one among many (Phillips 1997: 58; Takaki 1993b: 113). Levine also thoughtfully writes,

“in order to understand the nature and complexities of American culture, it is crucial to study and comprehend the widest possible array of the contributing cultures and their interaction with one another” (Levine 1996a).

It is a set of ideas that affirms the values of cultural differences within a society (Patchen 1999: 293).

Also, the meanings and purposes of multiculturalism vary from primary to higher education levels. Focusing on colleges and universities, the goals of multiculturalism are to (1) insert the knowledge of underrepresented people into the curriculum, (2) enhance the pedagogy that promotes critical thinking, and (3) prepare teachers and other professionals who will interact with people from a variety of backgrounds (La Belle and Ward 1996: 51-2).

With this understanding of what multiculturalism is, I will be using five theoretical models to explain the acceptance or rejection of a multicultural education. Each model will contain a set of variables that are formed by different disciplines. In

essence, some models have an educational slant, while other models are adopted by political scientists, sociologists and psychologists.

Demographic Factors

Demographic factors deal with the social status of individuals. Gender has been frequently used in early studies that deal with race-targeted policies and cultural diversity (Astin 1993; Bobo 1983; Bobo and Hutchings 1996; Bobo and Kluegel 1993; Link and Oldendick 1996; Pascarella et al. 1996; Qualls, Cox and Schehr 1992; Sears et al. 1997; Seltzer, Frazier and Ricks 1995; Wood and Chessser 1994). Some of these aggregated studies conclude that women show more positive attitudes toward race-targeted policies than men do (Link and Oldendick 1996; Milem 1994; Pascarella et al. 1996; Qualls, Cox and Schehr 1992; Seltzer, Frazier and Ricks 1995; Springer et al. 1996; Stack 1997; Wood and Chessser 1994).

Age is a pertinent variable that has shown mixed results. Some studies show that older respondents favor multiculturalism more than younger respondents. However, in the same research, age dampens support for equal opportunity (Link and Oldendick 1996). Likewise some studies find that older populations hold more negative attitudes toward minority groups (Glover 1991; Seltzer, Frazier and Ricks 1995) and others find that age has no bearing on racial attitudes (Bobo 1983; Bobo and Hutchings 1996; Bobo and Kluegel 1993; Sears et al. 1997).

Some studies show that a person's marital status can influence their political attitudes. Moreover, Seltzer and his associates (Seltzer, Frazier and Ricks 1995)

assume that those who are single might be less tolerant to new and different views
than those who experience marriage. In other words, those who are single might be
less supportive of multiculturalism. /

Many scholars have argued that a person's class standing can influence racial attitudes. Early proponents of the "hard hat" thesis argue that people from the working class are highly antagonistic to race-targeted policies. In being a key figure in this debate, Lipset insists that the working class people are "narrow-minded, intolerant and most of all 'authoritarian'" (Ehrenreich 1989: 110). To date, there has been some empirical support of this thesis. For instance, one study revealed that blue collar White men tended to have negative attitudes toward student and Black protests (Ransford 1972). Other studies also have found that low income White Americans tend to be stricter in cultural matters (Taylor and Lambert 1996), and Quillian also found that those who are from the lower class and face economic crisis are likely to feel threatened and eventually become hostile toward minority groups (1996: 821).

In more recent studies, the hard hat thesis has been rejected. For instance, Link and Oldendick (1996) find that income has no effect on attitudes toward multiculturalism. Similarly, Tuch and Hughes (1996) and Bobo and Kluegel (1993) reveal no effect of income on race-targeted policies. Finally, totally refute the "hard hat thesis," as they conclude that people who have lower incomes are more likely to support equality (Kinder and Sanders 1996: 279; Schuman et al. 1997). They argue that those who are economically disadvantaged tend to support policies that can also lift them up the economic ladder.

As these studies use income as a class indicator, it seems to be wise to also utilize a parent's education. Working on the assumption that education increases positive attitudes toward race-targeted policies and multiculturalism (Link and Oldendick 1996; Seltzer, Frazier and Ricks 1995; Tuch and Hughes 1996), it is assumed that higher education of respondents' parents leads to higher support for multiculturalism.

In earlier studies, some work suggests that the degree of urbanism carry some explanatory weight. For instance, a study of support for English-only legislation reveals that residents of towns with population of under fifty thousand tend to support English-only legislation more frequently than their urban counterparts (Freundreis and Tatalovich 1997). Also, Seltzer and his colleagues find that suburban residents are more likely to oppose multiculturalism than city dwellers (Seltzer, Frazier and Ricks 1995). In contrast, other studies reveal that living in urban settings does not predict attitudes toward race-targeted policies (Bobo and Kluegel 1993; Tuch and Hughes 1996).

Finally, the unique geographical component of this sample leads to the "Appalachian" variable. Growing up in Kentucky's Appalachia might have some effect on attitudes toward multiculturalism since Appalachians might view themselves as a cultural minority. Klotter (1985) describes how stereotypes of "Mountaineer" are in some ways similar to negative portraits of African Americans. Similarly, the study of Appalachians by Smith and Bylund found that two-thirds of the Appalachians in their study feel lack of respect compared to other Americans (1983: 262). That is,

being an Appalachian is to experience a type of inequality that is not experienced by others in different regions. Thus, they consider themselves as being different from people in other regions, moreover, being treated unfairly. Therefore, White Appalachians might show greater affinities with racial minorities since they might see themselves as equally being chastised by the White power structure (Turner 1985: xix). If this is the case, then Appalachian students might think that it is in their best interest to have more information on subordinated groups.

Or, in contrast, it is also possible that Appalachian students might have adopted the popular ideology that professes a deep distrust of people from different racial backgrounds. Or, since Appalachians perceive class inequalities more than racial inequalities (Smith and Bylund 1983), they might not focus on racial minority groups and it might affect attitudes toward multiculturalism.

Ideological Factors

The second cluster of variables deals with general orientations to societal institutions. It is assumed that if people have different beliefs toward the fairness and legitimacy of the prevailing social order, then these different ideological world views might impact multicultural attitudes. For instance, some studies conclude that people's attitudes toward obedience and conformity could have a bearing on their acceptance of racial policies (Alvarez and Brehm 1997) and an internalization of authoritarianism might increase the degree of prejudice (Weigel and Howes 1985). Thus, people with strong authoritarian predispositions might oppose multiculturalism.

Similarly, egalitarianism is examined. By borrowing Bobo's definition, egalitarianism is the rejection of social inequality and the promotion of actions to reduce persisting inequality (Tuch and Hughes 1996). With this definition in mind, the difference in egalitarian beliefs is frequently studied in various works (Alvarez and Brehm 1997; Bobo and Hutchings 1996; Bobo and Kluegel 1993; Gilens 1995; Sears 1988; Sidanius, Devereux and Pratto 1991; Taylor 1998). Among these studies, Sidanius and his colleagues discuss the strong effect of egalitarianism on degree of traditional racism, symbolic racism (1991: 388). Similarly, Alvarez and Brehm (1997) discover that egalitarianism has a positive impact on shaping opinions of race-targeted policies. That is, one who embraces egalitarianism is likely to support race-targeted policies.

Along a similar line, beliefs about how the economic system operates can have a bearing on this topic. The faith in meritocracy can result in blaming the victim and is negatively related to egalitarianism (Sidanius, Devereux and Pratto 1991), and has a significant impact on opposition to welfare (Gilens 1995). Therefore, it is similar to the discussion of egalitarianism and since it is assumed that the belief in the economic system that rewards the talented and hard working can be a predictor of multicultural attitudes.

Also, some studies suggest that religious beliefs might influence one's attitudes toward racial policies. For example, a study finds that Catholics are less likely to favor multiculturalism (Seltzer, Frazier and Ricks 1995). However, most studies find that denominational affiliation does not affect multicultural attitudes

(Glover 1991). Thus, this study will address other dimensions of religiosity.

Instead of denominational affiliation, the degree of orthodoxy seems to have an effect (Kirkpatrick 1993; Layman 1997; Secret, Johnson and Forrest 1990). That is, if one adamantly believes that one's religion has the one and only answer, they might be against educational practices that contest their "perfect" answer. Along this line, a study (Kirkpatrick 1993) of college students attitudes toward the discrimination against Blacks, women, homosexuals, and communists, finds that orthodoxy increases discriminatory attitudes. Additionally, Secret and his colleagues (1990) find that orthodoxy negatively influences political actions. Also, individuals with orthodox affiliations are more likely to support the Republican Party (Layman 1997). Thus, the present study will examine the influence of religious beliefs in terms of orthodoxy.

Lastly, one's self-defined political orientations and party commitments can influence the acceptance of multiculturalism. Although some studies argue that there is no real difference between self-identified liberals or conservatives (Sears 1988; Sears et al. 1997; Sidanius, Devereux and Pratto 1991), others say that the more one is liberal, the more he or she is likely to be supportive of racial policies and cultural diversity (Link and Oldendic 1996; Milem 94; Weigel and Howes 1985). For example, a study of support for English-only laws reveals that those who consider themselves as Republicans and Conservatives are more likely to embrace such a law (Freundreis and Tatalovich 1997). ~~Also,~~ Milem (1994) finds that men who are oriented to liberalism are more likely to have positive attitudes toward racial understanding.

Finally, people who are drawn to political information might seek a multicultural education. That is, people who are interested in the political process might have a desire to encounter a wide range of intellectual inputs. One study finds that those who are attentive to politics are more egalitarian and support equality (Kinder and Sanders 1996: 278). However, the contents of attention cannot be examined here, therefore, those who are conservatives or racists might also follow political matters closely, so this variable might have a curvilinear relationship with multiculturalism.

Contact with Members of Minority Groups

Another set of the studies considers the importance of interracial interactions. According to the “contact hypothesis,” racial resentments are supposedly found in Whites who are isolated from minorities. Conversely, those who have frequent multiracial exchanges are less likely to be prejudice. When breaking this argument into an analytical typology, not all contact levels are supported to have equal outcomes. With the types and conditions of contacts ranging from the casual to intimate and voluntary to involuntary contacts, each sort of interaction could present different effects (Patchen 1999).

Similar to the studies from the 60s and early 70s, some recent research continues to argue that intimate contacts produce different results than casual contacts. That is, close contacts, spending free time, dating, or inviting minorities into one’s house supposedly lessens some feelings of prejudice. A recent study

supports this notion and reveals that individuals engaged in more discussion about race issues tend to be more supportive of racial tolerance (Milem 1994). In addition, Sigelman and Welch (1993) reveal that simple contact does not guarantee a positive racial attitude, but having close interracial friendships decreases hostility for people of all racial groups. Similarly, Wright and his colleagues also find that extended contact with racial out-group members can lead to more positive inter-group attitudes (Wrights et al. 1997: 73). Further, Ellison, Powers, and Smith find that casual contacts with neighbors, workers and schoolmates have no effect (Ellison and Powers 1994; Powers and Ellison 1995; Smith 1994).

However, recent studies have questioned the notion that increased contacts decreases hostility. They argue that increased interactions in themselves do not lessen racial tensions. Instead, contact might lead in the opposite direction since greater interactions can increase racial hostilities. For instance, some studies argue that increased percentages of Black populations in predominately Whites' neighborhoods raises anti-Black prejudice (Taylor 1998), and brings more competition among groups (Quillian 1996: 821). Thus, it cannot be simply concluded that more contacts will necessarily bring about a desire for more racial and cultural understanding.

Perception of Race Relations in the U.S.

The fourth cluster of variables deals with the importance of perceptions about U.S. racial relations. In turning to perceptions, this set of theories emphasizes the importance of how people interpret the racial climate. That is, rather than looking

at a respondent's social status or general social values, these variables focus on how people decipher the complicated world of U.S. race relations. With this being a complicated matter with many dimensions, three sorts of connected but different theories emerge.

Overt Stereotypes

People who have internalized derogatory characterizations of minority groups might feel disinclined to multiculturalism. Early studies emphasize that many Americans still have overt negative stereotypes of racial minorities. Although the absolute numbers are declining, many Whites still believe racial minorities are lazy, unintelligent, violent, and more likely to be welfare cheats who are hard to get along with (Bobo 1983; Bobo and Hutchings 1996; Bobo and Kluegel 1993; Bobo and Zubrinsky 1996; Gilens 1995; Link and Oldendick 1996; Sears et al. 1997; Taylor 1998). Often Whites think that African Americans epitomize these characteristics, but many negative depictions are also applied to Asian, Hispanic, and Native Americans.

Based on these previous studies, it is argued that those who hold prejudices might be against multiculturalism. However, as straightforward as this theory seems, the degree of significance has varied across studies. Some discuss prejudice as the most powerful predictor of multicultural attitudes (Alvarez and Brehm 1997; Gilens 1995; Kinder and Sears 1981; Sears 1988; Sears et al. 1997; Sigelman and Tuch 1997). Others suggest that prejudice has an impact, but other racial interpretations are stronger predictors of support for multiculturalism (Bobo 1983; Bobo 1988a;

Bobo and Hutchings 1996; Bobo and Kluegel 1993; Bobo and Zubrinsky 1996; Quillian 1996; Sidanius, Devereux and Pratto 1991; Tuch and Hughes 1996). With this ambivalence toward the magnitude of overt prejudice, some theorists wanted to expand the notion of racial attitudes. Thus, the next section addresses more recent theoretical developments that emphasize different aspects of racial perceptions.

Symbolic Racism-Denial of Discrimination/Racism

In admitting that overt prejudice matters for some Whites, Sears and other “symbolic racism” theorists claim that recently Americans have shown fewer forms of overt racism. In its place, a new form of implicit and covert racism has appeared. Instead of embracing notions of the happy slave, the sexual predator, or the lazy loafer, today’s racism shows a different face. Basically, symbolic racism theory argues that people no longer explicitly say that minorities are inferior, as they deny the legitimacy of minority grievances (Sears 1988). That is, Whites do not carry the same venom toward minorities as much as they pretend as if the U.S. has solved its race problems. The leading theorist, Sears (1988), largely divides symbolic racism into three dimensions. First, he argues that symbolic racists deny the existence of discrimination and/or racism.¹ That is, they claim that America has ended its previous biases and that institutional racism has been abolished. Second, with no racism in the contemporary system, it seems bizarre that minorities keep complaining about a non-existent entity. That is, minority members are seen as people who keep fabricating racial problems that do not exist. Lastly, this denial of problems means that symbolic racists dislike programs that try to deal with racial inequalities.

Programs like Affirmative Action or bilingual education are seen as unnecessary wastes of money that address false problems. For instance, the study by Sears and his colleagues (1997) reveals that symbolic racism compared to other factors, has the strongest effect on attitudes toward racial-targeted policies described as “equal opportunity,” “federal assistance,” and “affirmative action” among anti-black affect, and traditional racial stereotypes.

Also, other studies present the strong effect of symbolic racism. Alvarez and Brehm (1997) found that symbolic racism influenced attitudes toward race-targeted policies and Kinder and Sears (1981) revealed its strong effect on the voting behavior during the mayoral election in L. A. As a whole, symbolic racism theorists claim that symbolic racism has the strongest effect on race-targeted policies among other factors including traditional stereotypes, egalitarianism, group conflict, and some demographic factors like education.

Resentment/Group Conflict

The last “racial theory” emphasizes the hostility toward the groups, which are fighting for minority rights (Kinder and Sanders 1997). According to Kinder and Sanders, racial resentment is

“a contemporary expression of racial discord, distinguishable from biological racism that once dominated American institutions and white opinion. Like symbolic racism, racial resentment features indignation as a central emotional theme, one provoked by the sense that black Americans are getting and taking more than their fair share” (Kinder and Sanders 1997: 293).

In emphasizing the racial resentment and indignation that is produced by the sense that Blacks are “getting and taking more than their fair share,” these recent resentment arguments can be considered in the frame of the theory of group conflict.² Although these two theories of racial resentment and group conflict are often discussed separately, this present study focuses on the perception of loosing.

The classic symbolic interactionist Herbert Blumer first dramatized the importance of conflict on racial perceptions. He criticized the traditional ways of equating prejudice with personality deficiencies in the 1950s. Instead, he highlighted that the dynamics of group processes and struggles influenced how people of different racial groups viewed each other (Blumer 1958b). In contextualizing racial ideas within power contests, group conflict theory views racial attitudes as the byproduct of the competition over scarce resources. That is, racism evolves out of the attempts to forge in-group superiority and out-group differences in light of group power struggles. In turn, these efforts to raise the group’s worth justify the economic privilege of the powerful. Finally, the rise of in-group claims over an out-group leads to the feeling of threat toward the out-group, and it eventually amplifies conflict among groups (Bobo 1988b: 95; Bobo and Hutchings 1996: 955).

Lawrence Bobo extends Blumer’s claim of prejudice as a “sense of group position” (Blumer 1958a) and establishes a theory of group conflict that is

“feelings of competition and hostility emerge from historically and collectively developed judgements about the positions in the social order that in-group members should rightly occupy relative to members of out-group” (Bobo and Hutchings 1996: 955).

In short, Whites as in-group members of the privileged group tend to defend their privileged positions, and this eventually leads to a conflict with out-group members who also try to get a share of the privileged positions.

In some studies, the notion of Black's dethroning Whites has been widely supported by some White subgroups. When addressing perceptions of Blacks, many Whites see the hiring and promotion of Blacks as creating unemployment and lesser opportunities for promotion for Whites (Rubin 1994). Moreover, this perceived loss of privileges results in a sense of being cheated by Affirmative Action programs. Similarly, Whites' opposition to the busing of minority students to white schools is related to their fear that their good educational environment will be taken by these invading minority groups (Bobo 1983).

In investigating the effects of group conflict, Bobo and Kluegel (1993) examine support for income-targeted and race-targeted policies. They conclude that group conflict is a powerful mitigator in one's perception of discrimination. Also Bobo (1988a) finds that group conflict negatively effects people's attitudes toward Black political campaigns. Furthermore, Bobo and Zubrinsky (1996) find that the attitudes toward residential integration are influenced more by group conflict than by traditional prejudice. In short, competition is crucial in this theory by focusing on the perceived loss of resources and privileges.

University Experiences and Situations

Since this study is concerned with matters at an American university, the last

cluster of variables relates to experiences within the college atmosphere. Those factors are broken down into academic and non-academic variables. Since college routines share official and unofficial experiences, many educational researchers have explored both realms of experiences.

People come to college for different reasons, and students who are intrinsically motivated to attend college tend to promote multiculturalism (Astin 1993; Milem 1994; Springer et al. 1996). Conversely, students who attend college for vocational or “partying” purposes are less likely to embrace multiculturalism. Similarly, students who aspire to attain higher degrees are more inclined to support multiculturalism than students who do not plan to pursue a higher degree.

How long a person remains in college also creates an impact. Some studies argue that “years of education” can produce a very small effect in promoting pro-multiculturalism attitudes (Case and Greeley 1990; Miville, Molla and Sedlacek 1992; Seltzer, Frazier and Ricks 1995) and create more positive attitudes toward minorities (Martire and Clark 1982). It is discussed that more education provides people with more information (Quinley and Glock 1979), or with more liberal social norms on college campuses (Smith 1981). Conversely, Bobo and Hutchings find no significance in years of education in their study of the perceived threats toward other groups (1996).

When years of education is considered, some may argue that students with better grades or academic achievement would favor multiculturalism. That is, the brighter and more inspired students might seek out a broader spectrum of

information. Conversely, those with the highest grades might embrace some of the ideological aspects that reduce multiculturalism support (i.e., meritocracy or competitiveness).

With students given some latitude in their selection of classes, the type of classes completed might influence their attitudes toward multiculturalism. Previous research reveals that those who study ethnic groups or gender in course are more likely to show favorable attitudes toward racial diversity (Astin 1993; Milem 1994; Pascarella et al. 1996; Springer et al. 1996).³ Stephan and Stephan (1984) examine the effects of multicultural curricula on prejudice and argue that the majority of these studies find a decrease of prejudice and some studies find no effect. Another study finds that such a multicultural course leads students to become more supportive of race-targeted policies to increase opportunities for minorities (Davine and Bills 1992).

Similarly, the students who gravitate toward certain majors show different levels of multicultural acceptance. For example, students in the humanities and social sciences are more likely to favor multiculturalism than those who major in engineering, business, physical science, nursing, mathematics, and statistics (Astin 1993; Milem 1994; Springer et al. 1996). Also students tend to be more open to cultural diversity and racial equality when they see their professors incorporating a great amount of multiculturalism into their classrooms (Astin 1993; Milem 1994; Miville, Molla and Sedlacek 1992).

Many informal university settings might influence the relationships of students with multiculturalism. Astin (1993) and Milem (1994) point to the

importance of peer group liberalism. If a student socializes with a liberal crowd of friends, the likelihood of having positive attitudes toward multiculturalism is quite high. However, those who associate with conservative friends tend to show a different outlook. Similarly, when students socialize with professors who are more liberal, they tend to be in favor of diversity and racial equality (Astin 1993; Milem 1994; Miville, Molla and Sedlacek 1992).

Also the perception of the college environment and the psychological well-being of students might have an influence. Thus, if a student is dissatisfied with and critical about a university, he or she might be also unfavorable to any issue, including multiculturalism (Sutherland 1981). In breaking dissatisfaction issues into separate areas, one can see that students might find their class content as irrelevant to their lives. That is, they may think that the college is often trivialized in formation, or they might think university learning is an attack to their “common sense” understanding of the world (Luttrell 1997). On another level, students might feel isolated on a campus. They might think that administrators do not care about students’ best interests and show little concern or compassion toward students. Thus, if a student feels that college is not an alien and cold situation, they might be strongly in favor of curriculum improvement. Conversely, students might feel so alienated that they reject all aspects of the college. That is, students who feel lonely might be against multiculturalism by blaming it as a center of the college attention that ignores students themselves.

Residential arrangements can have an influence since living in a dorm is

found to have a significant effect on favorable attitudes toward multiculturalism (Astin 1993; Milem 1994; Pascarella et al. 1996). It is considered that more interactions through on-campus residence allows students to be exposed to and have experiences with a variety of people compared to those who stay on campus only for short period of time. Regarding spending more time on campus, those who work full-time, spend more time watching television, or socialize less with friends are less likely to favor multiculturalism (Astin 1993; Milem 1994). Thus, I involve the examinations of relationships between attitudes toward multiculturalism and the conditions regarding residence in a dorm, hours of off-campus job, watching television and socializing with friends.

Joining extra curricular voluntary groups may influence student attitudes. In the past, Greek membership has been found to be significantly related to less openness to diversity (Milem 1994; Pascarella et al. 1996), and to having more racial prejudices (Muir 1991; Wood and Chesser 1994). Greek organization members may be less tolerant toward multiculturalism because they have limited socialization outside their own group. Rather, their time is spent in the fraternity or sorority and these organizations tend to be racially segregated to begin with. Therefore, the membership of Greek organizations might reveal a negative effect on attitudes toward multiculturalism.

There are several more factors such as non-academic experiences that are important to consider. Astin reveals a significant relationship between diversity attitudes and alcohol consumption (1993). The more students consume alcohol, the

less favorable their attitudes. However, there might be a question of spuriousness since a membership in a fraternity or a sorority may be related to heavy involvement of alcohol.

As a whole, I have described five theoretical models: demographic, ideological, contact, race relations theories, and university models. Based on these models and the accompanying the literature, I have identified variables relevant to each model. In analyzing the relationships between these variables and attitudes toward multiculturalism, it is crucial to identify the influential variables that explain the variance in attitudes. In short, this paper will elaborate the general attitudes of students in a mid-Atlantic university and identify the variables and models propel students into different attitude stances.

CHAPTER 4

METHODS

Sample

During the Fall semester of 1998, surveys were distributed at Morehead State University. Morehead State University is a public commuter university that is located in rural Eastern Kentucky. The university is the only public university in Appalachian Kentucky and mostly offers four-year degrees. At this institution, the majority of students are White and few racial minorities live in the surrounding counties. The institutional emphasis on diversity is minimal. For instance, in the Fall of 1998, the university has no established departments of Black, Asian, Chicano, or Women studies, although Women's studies has its own program. In fact, only a small smattering of race, Appalachian, and Women studies classes are offered in the English, History and Sociology departments.

In looking at the characteristics of the university, about 8,000 students were enrolled in the Fall semester of 1997. Women outnumbered men, with sixty percent of undergraduates being women. Most of the students came from the service region with Kentuckians making up seventy percent of the student body. Minority students were rare since they only consisted of 5 percent of the student populace.

Due to economic and political constraints, the population in Eastern Kentucky shows a high poverty rate. For example, in the county where the university is located, close to 25 percent of families lived below the poverty level in 1989 (Rural Development Working Group 1995). Moreover, many of the surrounding counties

had poverty rates that exceeded the 35 percent level in 1989. When looking at incomes, the adjacent communities had low per capita scores. With national income averaging \$20,114 per person in 1992 (Economics and Statistics Administration 1994: M58-9), the surrounding counties had per capita averages of \$11,208 (Economics and Statistics Administration 1994: 282, 292).

When exploring at the educational composition of the local counties, the percentage of high school graduates is low in Eastern Kentucky. For adults over 18 years old, only 20 percent in this region have high school diplomas and 7 percent of adults have bachelor's degrees in 1990 (Rural Development Working Group 1995). Thus, a high number of Morehead State University students are first generation college students who are from poor rural backgrounds.

Sampling Procedure

This study utilized a combination of purposive and convenience sampling. Being a student at Morehead State University, I sampled the students of my home institution. In establishing a list of possible respondents, my sampling came from the official classes at this university. Rather than conducting a random sample of all classes, a purposive sampling procedure was utilized. The sampling procedure was governed by two overarching objectives. First, the sample intentionally tried to gather respondents from a broad spectrum of academic disciplines. Earlier studies have shown that students from different majors exhibited particularistic attitudes toward multiculturalism (Astin 1994; Milem 1994; Springer et al. 1996). Second, I

wanted to gather information from upper and lower division courses. Thus, with these criterion in mind, I surveyed twenty classes from a variety of majors (two math, one chemistry, one biology, two marketing, two nursing, two Spanish, one sociology, one government, three social work, three English, one golf and one education).

With such a procedure, I collected a sample of four hundred and thirty seven students. The ages of the respondents ranged from 17 to 51 years old, with 76.8 percent of students in the 17 to 22 traditional student age groups (Mean = 22.2, SD = 5.9). The sample was composed of 59.2 percent females. Being an extremely White dominant university, 92 percent of the students were White and only 3 percent were Black.

When exploring the class backgrounds of students, a large percentage of the students came from impoverished backgrounds. About 15 percent of students earned or came from families with an income of less than \$15,000 in 1997 and about 6 percent of them placed themselves the income between \$15,000 and \$20,000. However, the student populace showed a large number of middle and upper class incomes. More than 30 percent of them put themselves in the category of \$50,000 or more. When considering the subjective classification of class, few of the students saw themselves as lower class (5%). Instead, three-fifth of the students called themselves middle class (60%), while about one third of the students said they were working class (32%) and one twentieth of students considered themselves to be upper class (4%). When looking at the education of their parents, slightly more than 30 percent of the students had either one or both parents graduated from high school

(higher than the general population levels). Remarkably, close to 30 percent of them had parents graduated from college.

Being in a rural commuter school, it was not surprising that almost 51 percent of the students grew up in rural areas, and 27 percent lived in small towns. Conversely, only 4 percent said they lived in the center cities and 11 percent of lived in the suburbs. When looking at regional background, 54 percent of the students grew up in Appalachian counties (see Measures for determining Appalachian status).

Measures

A survey instrument was constructed incorporating some close-ended indices from previous studies as well as several original items. For instance, the questions used to test for symbolic racism were adapted from the works of Sears and his colleagues (Sears et al. 1997; Kinder and Sanders 1996). In other cases, I used earlier questions as a foundation but then rephrased them in order to fit the target population.

Dependent Variable: Attitudes toward the Goal of Multiculturalism

Acceptance of multiculturalism was measured through a 6-item index. In using a 5-point Likert scale, people were asked to report their level of acceptance to particular statements. The questions dealt with themes of (1) the acceptance of the institutionalization of Women's studies and Black studies majors, (2) the value of requiring multicultural courses, (3) the importance of including multicultural experiences in the curriculum, (4) the worth of having more information and resources on multicultural issues, (5) the importance of having cultural and ethnic

diversity among school staff, and (6) the value of having multiculturalism related events or workshops (see Table 1 for details). The responses were coded so they ranged from 1 for strongly disagree (least support for multiculturalism) to 5 for strongly agree (most support). In looking for the reliability of this index, the items had an acceptable cronbach's alpha of .885.

Table 1. Items of Dependent Variable Index

For each item high scores indicate strong support of multiculturalism.	
Individual Item	Item Question
MAJOR REQUIREMENT	"This college should have women's studies and/or Black studies majors."
CURRICULUM	"More content on women and minorities should be taught in required courses."
INFORMATION	"The perspectives of a wide range of ethnic groups should be included into the curriculum."
STAFF	"I wish my college had more information or resources on minority issues."
WORKSHOP	"The school staff should reflect ethnic and cultural diversity."
	"There should be special events or workshops to celebrate different cultures through programs such as "Diversity Day.""

Independent Variables: Influential Factors

Tables 2 through 6 elaborate the measures for the separate explanatory models. The Demographic variables deal with personal information on gender, age, marital status and family background. For income, the data was coded as interval data. The questions asked students to specify their family income for 1997. Responses categories began with under \$5,000 and went up in \$5,000 intervals. In looking at the degree of urbanism, respondents were given five responses that ranged from a rural to a large metropolitan center area. Similarly, parent's education was coded as interval level data with eight responses ranging from middle school to a graduate degree. All of the nominal items were made into dummy variables. Thus,

marital status was coded 1 for single and 0 for everything else. Class status was transformed into a yes/no coding scheme (1=working class, 0=not working class for working class variable and 1=lower class, 0= not lower class for lower class variable). Finally, Appalachian status was identified by a person's long term county of residence. That was, after people submitted their county names, Raitz and Ulack's (1984) Appalachian schemata was used to identify an Appalachian or non-Appalachian student.

Table 2. Demographic Variables

Variable name	Item Question and/or codes
GENDER	Male=0 Female=1
AGE	"How old are you?"
SINGLE	Marital status was recoded Not single=0 and Single=1. "What is your present marital status?"
INCOME	Income was family income earned in 1997. If the respondent depends on parents, income refers to his/her parent(s)' income. "Roughly, in 1997, what was your family's total income? (if you primarily depend on parents, what was your parent(s)' total family income?)" It was coded ranging from 1=under \$5,000 to 11=\$50,000 or more with each category increasing in \$5,000 increments.
WORKING CLASS	Social class was recoded Not Working class=0 and Working class=1. "What social class do you classify yourself as?"
LOWER CLASS	Social class was recoded Not Lower class=0 and Lower class=1. "What social class do you classify yourself as?"
MOTHER'S EDUCATION	Respondents were given the question "What is your parent's education?" and had two columns of responses, one for mother and another for father. The responses ranged from Middle school or less=1, Some high school=2, High school graduate=3, Postsecondary school other than college (e.g. vocational school)=4, Some college=5, College degree=6, Some graduate school=7, and Graduate/Professional degree (e.g. Law, Medicine)=8.
FATHER'S EDUCATION	Father's education was measured by the same 8 categories and question used for Mother's education.
URBANISM	"Which of the following best describes the area where you grew up?" The responses were rural=1, small town (20,001-50,000)=2, mid size metropolitan area (50,001-100,000)=3, suburb of a large metropolitan area=4, and center city of a large metropolitan area=5.
APPALACHIAN	"When you were growing up, where did you spend most of your time?" The counties given were recoded as non-Appalachian county=0 and Appalachian county=1.

The Ideological variables (detailed in Table 3) explore the respondents' beliefs in authority, equality, meritocracy, religious orthodoxy, and political affiliations. For the authoritarianism scale, the first item emphasized the importance of children respecting authority figures, while the second item looked at the perceived benefits of a strong legal system (Alvarez and Brehm 1997; Sears et al. 1997). The scale had a sufficient level of reliability as indicated by cronbach's alpha (.653). For egalitarianism, the item dealt with the acceptance of inequality in life chances for people of different statuses (Glover 1991; Sidanius, Devereux and Pratto 1991). The item for meritocracy linked the connections between hard work and success (Gilens 1995).

Table 3. Ideology Variables

Variable name	Item Question and/or codes
AUTHORITARIANISM	Authoritarianism was measured through 2 items examining the degree of respect for authority and emphasis on law and order. "Respect for authority should be taught to all children." "Law and order should be strengthened in our society." These items were summed into an overall index of authoritarianism ranging from 2 (strong authoritarian) to 10 (least authoritarian).
EGALITARIANISM	Egalitarianism intended to measure the degree of belief in economic equality or fairness in economic situations. "It is not a big problem if some people have more life chances than others." The responses were coded from 1 to 5, indicating 1=anti-egalitarian to 5=strong egalitarian.
MERITOCRACY	"Anyone who works hard can succeed." Responses were coded from 1 to 5, with 1=strong meritocracy supporter to 5=less meritocracy supporter.
ORTHODOXY	The degree of orthodoxy was measured by examining the degree of belief in one's own church, religion and the interpretation of the Bible. It was measured through 3 items. The questions used were "My church has the only right way," "I think the world would be better off if everyone practiced my religion," and "The Bible is the word of God and should be taken literally word for word." They were summed into an overall index ranging from 3 (strong orthodoxy) to 15 (least orthodoxy).
POLITICAL ATTENTION	"I pay attention to politics." It was recoded with 1=low level of attention and 5=high level of attention.
POLITICAL IDEOLOGY	"What is your political ideology?" It was coded 1=far left, 2=strong liberal, 3=moderate liberal, 4=middle of the road, 5=moderate conservative, 6=strong conservative 7=far right.

The measurement for religious orthodoxy used a combination of three items. They were significantly correlated and had a reliability score using cronbach's alpha of .764. The first two items dealt with the absolutist notion of one's religion being superior to other religions (Mendleson et al. 1997; Secret et al. 1990) and the last item regarded a literal interpretation of the Bible (Layman 1997). For the extent of political attentiveness (Kinder and Sanders 1996), respondents were simply asked how often they paid attention to politics. Finally, political ideology was placed on the commonly used seven-point spectrum ranging from far left to far right (Link and Oldendick 1996; Sidanius, Devereux and Pratto 1991).

Contact variables, detailed in Table 4, investigated the frequency of contact with racial minorities. Three of the variables were based on eight-point responses of frequency of behaviors (everyday to almost never). For these frequency of contact variables, people were asked how often they chose to speak about race issues, ate ethnic foods, and saw their parents invite minorities into their family home. Interracial dating was made into a dummy variable, with 1 for experience of interracial dating and 0 for no experience. Finally, the county's racial composition was based on the percentage of non-Whites in the county reported by the student to be their long-term residence (County and City Data Book: <http://fisher.lib.Virginia.EDU/cgi-local/ccdbbin/countysort2.cgi>).

Table 4. Contact Variables

Variable name	Item Question and/or codes
MINORITY AT WORK	"At most of the places you have worked, what % of the employees were minorities?" It was recoded 1=less than 10% to 4=50-100%.
COUNTY RACIAL COMPOSITION	Percent of minority in county was measured by the percentage of a county. County was written down by respondents to the question "When you were growing up, where did you spend most of your time?" The County and City Data were used to determine the percentage.
FREE TIME WITH MINORITY	"At college, how often do you spend free time with members of other racial groups?" It measured the degree of socializing with minority groups during free time, which was likely to occur voluntarily. It was coded 1=daily, 2=weekly, 3=monthly, 4=a few times a year, 5=once a year, and 6=never or almost never.
INTERRACIAL DATE	"Have you ever dated a person of a different racial group?" It was coded 0=No and 1=Yes.
DISCUSSING ISSUES	"How often do you discuss racial and ethnic minority issues outside of classroom?" It measured how frequently, respondents discussed the issues voluntarily in their daily life. It was coded 1=everyday, 2=several times a week, 3=once a week, 4=several times a month, 5=once a month, 6=several times a year, 7=once a year and 8=never or almost never.
INVITING MINORITY	"How often did your parents invite members of other racial groups into your house?" It examined relationships with minority groups through having contacts at one's house that was considered to be more intimate than casual contact such as working, going to the same school, and living in the same neighborhood. It was coded 1=everyday to 8=never or almost never.
ETHNIC FOOD	"How often do you eat ethnic foods (e.g. Chinese, Korean, Mexican, Middle Eastern, etc.)?" It was coded 1=everyday to 8=never or almost never.

Race relations variables, detailed in Table 5, were derived from the theoretical treatises on stereotypes, symbolic racism, resentment, and group conflict. All of the items used Likert scales that ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The stereotypes index employed four items by referring to some frequently used stereotypes (Bobo 1983; Bobo and Hutching 1996; Bobo and Kluegel 1993; Bobo and Zubrinsky 1996; Gilens 1995; Link and Oldendick 1996; Sigelman and Tuch 1997). In the index, respondents were asked to rank the perceived work ethic, intelligence, and social etiquette of racial minorities. These items were highly correlated and had cronbach's alpha of .618. In designing the research, the general

term minority rather than particular ethnic groups was employed since this made the survey shorter.

In trying to create an index for the denial of racism, I originally created five items that originated from the work of Sears (1988). These questions dealt with the themes of discrimination as an obstacle to success, the degree of improvement in today's socio-economic condition, the recognition of current racism, and perception of prejudice on the campus. However, a low cronbach's alpha score revealed that the items were not similar enough to be considered a measurement of a single, stable concept. Thus, in the end, I decided to use the item that seemed to have the best face validity. In doing so, I selected the item measuring whether or not respondents recognized the existence of racism today and high scores showed recognition of racism.

When measuring the racial resentment of respondents, a four-item index with a cronbach's alpha of .758 was constructed (Sears 1988; Kinder and Sanders 1996; Glover 1991; Seltzer, Frazier and Ricks 1995). One question dealt with Blacks "unfairly" using affirmative action to their so-called selfish benefits, another question addressed the perceived governmental favoritism toward Blacks. The last two items dealt with professors who supposedly addressed cultural diversity too often and a perception that political minorities were impolite and too adamant when demanding change. It was coded to illustrate that low scores meant a high degree of resentment.

The group conflict index dealt with general economic matters and college specific topics. The items were significantly correlated and had a sufficient level of

reliability indicated by cronbach's alpha (.633). One question addressed the conviction that Whites got fewer scholarships than Blacks, another addressed the perception of Whites losing power when minority students organized politically. Finally, there was a general question on how minority economic upward mobility affected Whites. Most of these questions were developed from Bobo and Hutchings's research (1996). The scale was coded so high score meant less feelings of threat.

Table 5. Race Relation Variables

Variable name	Item Question and/or codes
STEREOTYPE	Stereotype was measured through a 4-item index. They were summed into an overall index of stereotype ranging from 4 (strongly agree/prejudiced) to 20 (strongly disagree/least prejudiced). It was measured through four frequently used negative stereotypes directed to minority groups. Here, I did not strictly refer to a particular minority group, such as African American, instead open to respondents' definition of minority groups. Items that were stated positively were recoded indicating higher score showed holding least stereotypes. "Minorities are generally lazy." "Minorities are mostly intelligent." (Recoded) "Minorities prefer to be supported by welfare." "Minorities are easy to get along with." (Recoded)
SYMBOLIC RACISM	"Minorities frequently see racism where it does not exist." It was coded 1=strongly agree to 5=strongly disagree.
RESENTMENT	Resentment was measured through a 4-item index. It measured the feelings about the government role, government program, such as affirmative action, equal rights movements, and teachers' role. They were summed into an overall index of resentment ranging from 4 (strongly agree/strong resentment) to 20 (strongly disagree/least resentment). "Over the years, the government has shown more attention to Blacks than they deserve." "I cannot stand when Blacks use affirmative action for their own benefits." "Minorities are too demanding when pushing for equal rights." "Teachers spend too much time looking at different cultures."
GROUP CONFLICT	Group conflict was measured through a 3-item index. It examined the perception of competition with minority groups over economic resources, power on campus and scholarships. They were summed into an overall index of group conflict ranging from 3 (strongly agree/strong feeling of competition) to 15 (strongly disagree/little feeling of competition). "As Blacks move ahead economically, more and more Whites fall behind." "The more power minorities have on campus, the less power Whites have on campus." "Black students get more scholarships than White students do."

The university questions, detailed in Table 6, contained a mixed set of scales that were derived from a variety of research (Astin 1993; Ellison and Powers 1994; Milem 1994; Newswanger 1996; Pascarella and et al. 1996; Powers and Ellison 1995; Sigelman and Welch 1993; Springer et al. 1996; Sutherland 1981; Tuch and Hughes 1996; Wood and Chesser 1994). The concept of collegiate motivation was addressed by asking students the degree to which “partying” was an incentive for attending college (Easterlin and Crimmins 1994; Springer et al. 1996). Responses categories ranged from 1=Strongly agree to 5=Strongly disagree. The same format was used to measure the degree to which desiring for an advanced degree. When addressing the perceived sentiments of peers, the perception of peer liberalism was also explored. Students were asked, on a 5-point scale, the degree to which they agreed or disagreed that their professors were liberal and if the professors intentionally incorporated multicultural issues into their class content.

The alienation of students was explored through three questions with a sufficient reliability of cronbach’s alpha (.679). Two of the questions dealt with the extent of insensitive treatment of students by the university, and the last question dealt with students finding no salience in the class material. Lastly, the loneliness of the student measure questioned the extent of student isolation.

When assessing class standing, students rankings were translated into numbers (1=Freshman to 5=Graduate). The matter of academic achievement was accessed through the students’ self-identified GPA. For the variable of majors, the nominal categories were transformed into dummy variables. Thus, majors were

broken into five yes/no variables (i.e. Business=1, No Business=0). Similarly, the experiences of completing minority courses, living in a dorm, and Greek membership were turned into dummy variables. For those questions, students who had minority courses, lived in a dorm, and had a Greek membership were coded as 1.

For the non-academic issues, two different scales were employed. TV watching was examined by the typical number of hours watching per day, while the number of hours at work was placed at the weekly level. Also, the amount of socialization with friends and alcohol consumption were placed on an 8-point scales of frequency (everyday was coded as 1 and almost never was coded as 8).

Table 6. University Variables

Variable name	Item Question and/or codes
PARTYING	"I attend college because I want to party." It was coded 1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree.
HIGHER DEGREE	"When I graduate from college, I will enroll for a more advanced degree." It was recoded 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree.
CLASS STAND	"What is your classification at MSU?" It was coded 1=Freshman, 2=Sophomore, 3=Junior, 4=Senior and 5=Graduate.
ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT	Academic achievement was measured by GPA in numbers. "What is your GPA? (if this is your first semester, what is your high school GPA?)"
MINORITY COURSE	It was measured by the experience of taking minority courses or not. "At college(s), did you take any minority or gender related courses such as American Minority Relations, Appalachian Studies, Women's studies?" It was coded 0=never taking courses and 1=taking courses.
MAJOR	"What is your major?" The respondents were asked to write down their majors and I used Dummy variables for each major after collapsing into disciplines: Business major, Hard Science, Social work, Social Science, Nurs/Medical and coded 1 for yes for each majors.
PEER (Liberal)	"Most of my friends are liberal." It was recoded 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree.
PROFESSOR (Liberal)	"Most of my professors are liberal." The definition of liberal was dependent on the respondents. It was recoded 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree.
PROFESSOR (Multicultural)	"Most of my professors use readings or materials on racial and/or gender related multiculturalism issues in courses." Here, also the definition of multiculturalism depended on the respondents. It was recoded 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree.
ALIENATION	Alienation was measured through a 3-item index. It was examined by the feelings toward university; how it treated students, what it offered for students to learn, and how it affected student life. They were summed into an overall index of cynicism ranging from 3 (strongly agree/least satisfied with university) to 15 (strongly disagree/most satisfied). "Students in this university are treated like numbers." "University courses don't deal with important issues." "University administrators don't care how their decisions affect student life."
LONELINESS	It measured the degree of loneliness on campus. "I feel lost and alone much of the time on campus." It was coded 1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree.
DORM	"Do you live on campus (residential dorm)?" It was coded 0=No and 1=Yes.
OFF-CAMPUS JOB	It was measured in hours. "In this semester, how many hours per week on the average do you work for pay off-campus?"
TV	TV was measured in hours. "How many hours a day do you usually watch TV?"
FRIENDS	Friend measured the degree of socialization with friends. "How often do you socialize with friends?" It was coded 1=everyday and 8=never or almost never.
GREEK	"Have you ever belonged to a fraternity or a sorority?" It was coded 0=No and 1=Yes.
ALCOHOL	Alcohol measured the degree of alcohol consumption among students. "How often do you drink alcohol?" It was coded 1=everyday to 8=never or almost never.

CHAPTER 5 RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics: Attitude toward the Goal of Multiculturalism

If one only reads books on this subject, one might believe that all Americans have strong negative or positive feelings about multiculturalism. Most of the conservatives have presented strong indictments against a multicultural education while others have praised its value. However, these comments did not translate into the everyday world of the students in this study. Rather than being strong proponents or opponents of multiculturalism, most students gave neutral or lukewarm responses to multiculturalism items. In all of the items, anywhere between 75 percent to 59 percent of the students mildly supported or were not sure about multiculturalism. Clearly, this meant that students did not even have strong or clear attitudes toward multiculturalism.

Table 7. Percent of Dependent Variable Index

Item name	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean	S.D.
MAJOR REQUIREMENT	9.5%	31.6%	37.7%	11.2%	10.0%	3.195	1.084
CURRICULUM	7.4	23.0	36.4	24.4	8.8	2.958	1.060
INFORMATION	7.0	42.5	32.5	12.3	5.8	3.325	0.977
STAFF	4.4	23.0	47.2	17.9	7.4	2.991	0.941
WORKSHOP	9.0	40.6	32.3	12.8	5.3	3.353	0.994
	12.3	37.2	30.0	12.3	8.1	3.333	1.098

When looking at the strong affirmations of multiculturalism, only one item resulted in the double digits. The presence of a workshop netted the highest score of 12.3 percent, while most of the other scores fell into the 7 to 4 percent range. Conversely, the strong objections to multiculturalism only reached the double digits

once (Major). Similar to the Strongly agrees, most other Strongly disagrees fell in the range between 5 to 8 percent.

When addressing the vast majority, about 70 percent gravitated to Agrees or Not sures. Moreover, constantly 30 to 47 percent of students fell into the category of Not sures. As a whole, this category contained largest or second largest proportion of the students in the study chose this response. It is clear that they do not hold an explicit position regarding multiculturalism or simply did not state their true or real position. As most students showed weak support for multiculturalism on some measurements, many of the respondents switched alliances for different items.

In addition, the shifts of percents showed general patterns. There was some mild support for the questions that tapped an optional multicultural education. On the questions of providing workshops, having a multicultural staff, and having the general curriculum be more multicultural, the modal score was Agree. Thus, students mildly accepted a multicultural education when it was seen as voluntary, non-standardized, and inapplicable to all students.

However, when the issues of multiculturalism was seen as a universal requirement for knowledge building or graduation, students were less supportive. In essence, when asking if students they personally wanted to learn more, the number of Not sures and Disagrees expanded. Subsequently, many students mildly supported a multicultural curriculum as long as it was not directly applied to themselves.

Similarly, when multiculturalism was seen as a part of required classes, the support for multiculturalism evaporated even more. In fact, this was the only instance in

which the number of Disagrees outnumbered the Agrees. Thus, this table supported the notion of the implementation gap. That is, Whites are in favor of racial programs when they are seen as non-binding and voluntary. However, when a multicultural education became requirement as for the entire student body, many Whites shift into the oppositional mode. Thus, we can conclude that most of the students supported multiculturalism as long as they could dodge multiculturalism classes. However, when a multicultural education is seen as widespread and unavoidable, much of their support disappears.

Explanatory Statistics: The Factors that Influence Multiculturalism Attitudes

After noting the general tendencies of mild or conditional support for multiculturalism, this section explores the factors that explain the contours of attitudes variance. To do so, five pairwise multiple regressions were conducted. The first model included demographic variables, then ideological, contact, race relations, university variables and so on. By the end, the accumulated effect of each variable and model will be ascertained since the last regression statistically controls for the other variables.

Model 1: Demographic Factors

Model 1 in Table 8 contains only demographic variables. As a total, these variables were not powerful as they only explained 11 percent of the multicultural variance. Most of the explained variance resulted from three demographic variables, while the other seven variables were not statistically significant. None of self-defined

class indicators showed any statistical significance,[✓] nor did parent's education.

✓ Furthermore, people with different marital status did not show different attitudes toward multiculturalism.[✓] Lastly, a person's geographical background also seemed to be irrelevant. Attitudes did not vary by the amount of urbanism nor did the students from Appalachian counties show any difference from students from non-Appalachian areas.

On the other hand, three variables presented an impact.[✓] By far, the issue of gender had the biggest impact.[✓] With a moderate association, women had more positive attitudes toward multiculturalism than men. Another demographic factor, age, had a weak effect. Support for multiculturalism increased as a person grew older.[✓] Finally, income showed a weak relationship.[✓] Rather than supporting the notion that poor people are against racial equality or cultural diversity, it is the more affluent people who oppose multiculturalism.

Table 8. Standardized Betas for Regression of Support for Goals of Multiculturalism on Demographic (Model 1) and Ideological (Model 2) Variables

Independent Variable	Model 1	Model 2
Gender	0.204(0.489)**	0.135(0.509)**
Age	0.129(0.050)*	0.060(0.050)
Single	0.046(0.654)	0.029(0.638)
Income	-0.122(0.087)*	-0.100(0.085)
Lower class	0.091(1.171)	0.090(1.161)
Working class	-0.033(0.559)	-0.029(0.549)
Mother's Education	0.061(0.159)	0.030(0.155)
Father's Education	-0.066(0.156)	-0.040(0.153)
Urbanism	0.072(0.238)	0.075(0.237)
Appalachian	-0.044(0.546)	-0.057(0.541)
Authoritarianism		-0.104(0.176)*
Egalitarianism		0.123(0.244)*
Meritocracy		0.138(0.216)**
Orthodoxy		-0.034(0.077)
Political Attention		0.099(0.202)*
Political ideology		-0.163(0.224)**
R ²	0.113	0.185

*p<.05 **p<.01

Note: Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

Model 2: Demographic and Ideological Factors

Model 2 added the ideological factors to Model 1. In adding these variables to the formula, the ideological variables did not dramatically extend the explanatory power. In fact, the R² only increased by .072 points. However, the inclusion of these new perceptions altered the relationship of previously significant variables. When controlling for the ideological issues, the effects of income and age disappeared. Thus, we can conclude that age and income in themselves do not really drive the relationship, but rather the beliefs of these poor and older people are what really matters.

Conversely, when looking at the new variables, only the religious orthodoxy

was not statistically significant. Thus, those with absolutist and literal cosmologies did not have different attitudes from their less orthodox counterparts. In taking the significant variables one at a time, the self-identified liberals were friendlier toward multiculturalism than the conservatives. Contrary to the notion that authoritarian persons are more prejudiced and have less tolerance, the students who were more authoritarian were likely to favor multiculturalism. Before concluding that simply authoritarian personality leads to higher level of prejudice, it seems that the examination of content of laws needs to be considered. Some might be supporting a law to maintain a bilingual education, but they are not necessarily more authoritarian just because they support law. On the other hand, the same people might be against a law to end a bilingual education. In other words, people embrace some law and discard others. Thus, we should not simply conclude that authoritarianism leads to anti-multicultural attitudes.

Students who believed in equality were more in favor of multiculturalism. The faith in the U.S. meritocracy also presented differences among students. Those who saw success as coming to the talented tended to oppose multiculturalism more than those who viewed a society as less fair. At the same time, the amount of effort seeking political information had an effect. Students who paid attention to politics had more positive attitudes toward multiculturalism. Finally, students who considered themselves to be liberal tended to embrace multiculturalism, while students who called themselves as conservatives were inclined to less favor multiculturalism.

On the whole, the model shows some interesting insights. Students who are female, liberal, embrace the notions of “law and order,” believe less in meritocracy and more in equality, and who pay attention to politics and consider themselves to be liberal tend to support multiculturalism. Conversely, male conservatives who are less authoritarian and anti-egalitarian and believe in meritocracy view multiculturalism goals less favorably. Thus, in general, the people who see greater legitimacy in the prevailing social order are less likely to support a multicultural education, while the one who are more liberal tend to accept an importance of a multicultural education.

Model 3: Demographic, Ideological and Contact Factors

When adding the contact variables onto the equation, the amount of variance explained again jumped by about 8 points. Although the explanatory strength of the contact variables was not outstanding, they certainly changed some relationships. For instance, the previously important factors of authoritarianism, meritocracy, and political attention lost their significance. When controlling for the amount of contact with minorities, these ideological factors became inconsequential. Thus, people may conclude that amount of contact with minorities overwhelms these three ideological variables. On the other hand, the contact variables did not mitigate the impact of gender, egalitarianism and liberalism. That is, regardless of how often women and liberals interacted with minorities, they still embraced a multicultural education more than their conservative male counterparts.

Among the new variables, only four out of seven variables were seen as impertinent. The proportion of minorities in one’s hometown, or how often one ate

ethnic food seemed to be unimportant. Interestingly, the amount of interaction with minorities in family settings had no repercussions. Neither does having any racial minorities in one's childhood household nor does dating people of different races have any predictable positive or negative effects.

Finally, three of the contact variables were significant. Students who discuss minority issues tended to support multiculturalism more than their tight-lipped peers. Also, those who spent more free time with minorities were more inclined to accept multiculturalism. These two variables showed frequent contacts with minorities resulted in positive attitudes toward multiculturalism. ^VContrary to expectations, students who worked more with minorities had less favorable attitudes toward multiculturalism.

Table 9. Standardized Betas for Regression of Support for Goals of Multiculturalism on Demographic (Model 1), Ideological (Model 2), Contact (Model 3) and Race Relation (Model 4) Variables

Independent Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Gender	0.204(0.489)**	0.135(0.509)**	0.133(0.513)*	0.017(0.450)
Age	0.129(0.050)*	0.060(0.050)	0.071(0.050)	0.064(0.043)
Single	0.046(0.654)	0.029(0.638)	-0.001(0.634)	0.035(0.540)
Income	-0.122(0.087)*	-0.100(0.085)	-0.064(0.086)	-0.056(0.073)
Lower class	0.091(1.171)	0.090(1.161)	0.080(1.153)	0.052(0.990)
Working class	-0.033(0.559)	-0.029(0.549)	-0.046(0.544)	-0.045(0.462)
Mother's Education	0.061(0.159)	0.030(0.155)	0.011(0.156)	-0.027(0.133)
Father's Education	-0.066(0.156)	-0.040(0.153)	-0.053(0.153)	0.009(0.131)
Urbanism	0.072(0.238)	0.075(0.237)	0.044(0.262)	-0.007(0.224)
Appalachian	-0.044(0.546)	-0.057(0.541)	-0.030(0.548)	-0.049(0.466)
Authoritarianism		-0.104(0.176)*	-0.092(0.174)	-0.063(0.151)
Egalitarianism		0.123(0.244)*	0.128(0.243)*	0.064(0.208)
Meritocracy		0.138(0.216)**	0.098(0.216)	0.064(0.184)
Orthodoxy		-0.034(0.077)	-0.052(0.077)	-0.047(0.066)
Political Attention		0.099(0.202)*	0.052(0.205)	0.027(0.175)
Political ideology		-0.163(0.224)**	-0.118(0.228)*	0.006(0.200)
Minority at work			-0.101(0.304)*	-0.080(0.259)
% of minority			-0.029(0.037)	-0.008(0.032)
Free time w/ minority			-0.167(0.139)**	-0.101(0.120)*
Interracial date			0.069(0.580)	0.024(0.494)
Discussing issue			-0.170(0.112)**	-0.134(0.095)**
Inviting minority			0.005(0.124)	-0.026(0.107)
Ethnic food			-0.011(0.137)	-0.002(0.116)
Stereotype				0.171(0.098)**
Symbolic racism				0.125(0.238)**
Resentment				0.393(0.094)**
Group conflict				-0.061(0.111)
R ²	0.113	0.185	0.263	0.476

*p<.05 **p<.01

Note: Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

In looking at the third model as a whole, female, egalitarian, and liberal students are more inclined to have favorable attitudes toward multiculturalism. Similarly, those who talk about minority topics and spend more social time with minorities seem more inclined to support a multicultural education. In addition,

students who work with fewer minorities tend to accept multiculturalism.

Conversely, anti-egalitarian, conservative male students who have more contacts with minorities at workplaces tend to oppose multiculturalism.

Model 4: Demographic, Ideological, Contact and Race Relation Factors

The inclusion of the race relation theories dramatically improved the explanatory power of the independent variables. Rather than seeing a small increase, the R^2 grew by 21 percent. The potency of the race variables was so impressive that they nullified the effects of most other variables. For example, all of the demographic and ideological variables became irrelevant after the race theories were introduced. Equally notable, the contact with minorities at work lost its effect.

In examining the newly added variables, three of the four perception variables exhibited tremendous effects. Both the amount of ^vinternalized stereotypes and the denial of racism had important effect on multiculturalism. Students who recognize the existence of racism and discarded the negative portraits of minority groups tended to value the importance of multiculturalism. Furthermore, the ^vresentment variable broadly surpassed the strength of these variables as the resentment variable reached the moderate level of influence ($B=.393$). Therefore, the amount of resentment seems to have the greatest explanatory strength of these four models.

In making sense of these findings, some empirical truths become quite evident. The demographic characteristics of people have little effect when the perceptions of race relations are placed in the model. Similarly, the overall

ideological world views are irrelevant when race perceptions are integrated into the model. Moreover, only the contact variables of socializing with minorities and talking about racial issues have positive influence in this model. Thus, a simple truism becomes apparent. When addressing matters of acceptance of a multicultural education, the type of social status does not seem to matter. Moreover, many of the objective levels of racial interactions show little impact. Instead, the way in which people perceive the race relations is what matters. More precisely, if Whites think that minorities are inferior, that racism does not exist, and that minorities are challenging their privileged place, it follows then that these individuals oppose any efforts of a multicultural education. Conversely, if people do not embrace these beliefs, then they are more likely to support a multicultural education.

Model 5: Demographic, Ideological, Contact, Race Relation, and University Factors

The last regression added the University variables into the calculations (see Table 10). With most of these variables showing little impacts, the R^2 was increased only by about 5 percent. In fact, with questions on the university settings providing such a small boost, it seems safe to assume that racial predispositions of undergraduate students outweighs most of effects of the university's social milieu.

While most of the university variables had such small effects that they were not worth noting, some of the findings need to be mentioned. Many of the previously strong variables amounted to no noticeable impact. With majors showing no significance, none of the majors had a monopoly on the acceptance of a multicultural education. Furthermore, the amount of satisfaction with the school seemed to be

unimportant and the membership to Greek organizations proved to have no discernible impact.

Only, three of the university variables had significant effects. These significant variables all dealt with perceptions of social cues from reference groups. In these cases, when professors and student colleagues were seen as proponents of a multicultural education, then the students were more prone to see themselves as multiculturalism advocates. Thus, the importance of creating pro-multiculturalism social environment must be stressed. That is, if student and professorial sub-cultures affirm the value of a multicultural education, then students are more likely to embrace the multiculturalism notion.

When making some final assessments of the total model, some salient points appear. First, when simultaneously addressing all variables, none of the demographic or ideological variables shows an impact. Second, the general amount of contact with racial minorities shows little impact on some students in Eastern Kentucky. However, this rejection of the content thesis has a caveat. The unintentional interactions with minorities in the social environment have no impact, but the purposeful socializing with friends on free time is positively related to an acceptance of multiculturalism. Lastly, these findings highlight the importance of the interpretative process. When people envision that their college friends and professors are liberals, they are more likely to be multiculturalism supporters. Moreover, those who hold derogatory notions of minorities and pretend that racism has disappeared are generally against a multicultural education. But among all of these variables, it is clear that degree of

✓
racial resentment is by far the most paramount variable. Thus, we can conclude that people who feel cheated by present race relations will be the first to join an anti-multiculturalism backlash.

Table 10. Standardized Betas for Regression of Support for Goals of Multiculturalism

IV	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Gender	0.204(0.489)**	0.135(0.509)**	0.133(0.513)*	0.017(0.450)	0.000(0.486)
Age	0.129(0.050)*	0.060(0.050)	0.071(0.050)	0.064(0.043)	0.007(0.051)
Single	0.046(0.654)	0.029(0.638)	-0.001(0.634)	0.035(0.540)	0.039(0.560)
Income	-0.122(0.087)*	-0.100(0.085)	-0.064(0.086)	-0.056(0.073)	-0.068(0.074)
Lower class	0.091(1.171)	0.090(1.161)	0.080(1.153)	0.052(0.990)	0.075(1.016)
Working class	-0.033(0.559)	-0.029(0.549)	-0.046(0.544)	-0.045(0.462)	-0.043(0.475)
Mother's Edu	0.061(0.159)	0.030(0.155)	0.011(0.156)	-0.027(0.133)	-0.041(0.137)
Father's Edu	-0.066(0.156)	-0.040(0.153)	-0.053(0.153)	0.009(0.131)	0.011(0.136)
Urbanism	0.072(0.238)	0.075(0.237)	0.044(0.262)	-0.007(0.224)	0.003(0.231)
Appalachian	-0.044(0.546)	-0.057(0.541)	-0.030(0.548)	-0.049(0.466)	-0.077(0.481)
Authoritarianism		-0.104(0.176)*	-0.092(0.174)	-0.063(0.151)	-0.060(0.158)
Egalitarianism		0.123(0.244)*	0.128(0.243)*	0.064(0.208)	0.081(0.214)
Meritocracy		0.138(0.216)**	0.098(0.216)	0.064(0.184)	0.030(0.191)
Orthodoxy		-0.034(0.077)	-0.052(0.077)	-0.047(0.066)	-0.073(0.068)
Political Attention		0.099(0.202)*	-0.052(0.205)	0.027(0.175)	0.013(0.179)
Political ideology		-0.163(0.224)**	-0.118(0.228)*	0.006(0.200)	0.037(0.208)
Minority at work			-0.101(0.304)*	-0.080(0.259)	-0.092(0.262)*
% of minority			-0.029(0.037)	-0.008(0.032)	-0.011(0.033)
Free time w/ minority			-0.167(0.139)**	-0.101(0.120)*	-0.109(0.130)*
Interracial date			0.069(0.580)	0.024(0.494)	0.015(0.510)
Discussing issue			-0.170(0.112)**	-0.134(0.095)**	-0.083(0.101)
Inviting minority			0.005(0.124)	-0.026(0.107)	-0.048(0.110)
Ethnic food			-0.011(0.137)	-0.002(0.116)	-0.012(0.120)
Stereotype				0.171(0.098)**	0.143(0.101)**
Symbolic racism				0.125(0.238)**	0.117(0.248)*
Resentment				0.393(0.094)**	0.381(0.097)**
Group conflict				-0.061(0.111)	-0.039(0.114)
College Value					-0.019(0.217)
Higher degree					0.049(0.195)
Class stand					-0.002(0.237)
Academic achievement					-0.026(0.426)
Courses					0.200(0.651)**
Business					0.095(0.709)
Hard Science					-0.005(0.663)
Social Work					-0.056(0.792)
Social Science					0.002(0.941)
Nurs/Med					0.011(0.645)
Peer-liberal					0.107(0.264)*
Professor-liberal					-0.041(0.276)
Professor-multicultural					0.095(0.213)*
Cynicism					-0.007(0.087)
Loneliness					-0.038(0.229)
Dorm					0.040(0.497)
Off-campus job					0.037(0.019)
TV					-0.032(0.102)
Friends					0.002(0.198)
Greek					-0.030(0.587)
Alcohol					0.046(0.114)
R ²	0.113	0.185	0.263	0.476	0.529

*p<.05 **p<.01

Note: Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

In this project, student attitudes toward multiculturalism were explored through various educational and sociological theoretical lenses. Unlike previous research that tends to focus on a few theories, this research measures various theories at the same time. From these extended theoretical perspectives, the results indicate that students in Eastern Kentucky demonstrate present mild or conditional support of multiculturalism. Moreover, the mild support is generally withdrawn when the multicultural education is seen as universal requirement for all students. Clearly, this tepid and provisional support reinforces the notion of the implementation gap (Schuman et al. 1997). Thus, Kentuckians, like other Americans, support principle of equality in the abstract form until they believe that the actual action will change their life styles.

These results are important to educational planners since they reveal the importance of peers and professors in affecting the support for multiculturalism. Educational planners might try to construct social settings that reinforce pro-multiculturalism sentiments. However, the findings suggest that they must do so in a way that is perceived as voluntary and non-obligatory.

Also, the findings on contact variables call for more need of study of the “contact hypothesis.” Simply, frequent contacts with minorities do not necessarily produce positive attitudes toward multiculturalism. That is, in some cases contacts have no impact on acceptance of multiculturalism. On the other hand, we see some

incompatible cases in which contact fosters some higher or lower acceptance rates of a multicultural education. When contacts are intimate and seen as discretionary, the effect is positive. Moreover, the most vital contact variable is when contact is seen as a self-selected process of making friendship. However, contacts at workplace affect the relationships in the opposite direction. That is, greater minority contact at the place of employment intensifies a rejection of multicultural education. Perhaps, this is due to the competition based on conditions of the workplace which might increase the amount of anxiety or fear among Whites. That is, the battle over recognition or higher wages might exasperate the perceptions the minorities are encroaching on "White" jobs.

Finally, this paper highlights the importance of students holding onto certain racial attributions. Those who see minorities as inferiors or those who think racism has disappeared, are more likely to reject a multicultural education. Moreover, Whites who see their fates deteriorating due to minority activities are least likely to favor a multicultural education. Thus, this process of scapegoat seems to have the strongest influence on attitudes toward multiculturalism. Also, it is important to note that stereotypes are considered as an illustration of traditional racism on the one hand, and symbolic racism is perceived as a new form of racism on the other hand. It is discussed that the latter is rising while the former is disappearing in today's society. However, in the present study reveals that the effect of stereotypes on these attitudes is a bit stronger than that of symbolic racism. It calls for reconsideration of the role of stereotypes.

Before taking these findings as an end all for this discussion, this research also has some limitations. In the end, I noticed that some of the measures had some flaws. First, some of the items measuring attitudes toward minorities treat separate minorities as one homogeneous group. The treatment of all groups as simple “minorities” can be problematic, since some bigots might show different attitudes toward different hated groups. Future work should include questions about each distinct minority group including African Americans, Asian Americans, Hispanic Americans, native Americans, women, elderly, disables, gays and lesbians and so on.

Furthermore, several of the other questions might be ambiguous. Some students may have considered their parents’ income, while others might have added only their financial aid and occupational earnings. Similarly, the questions on urbanism might have been confusing. Respondents might have moved several times during their youth. Also the definitions of rural settings might differ among the students. Adding to these measurement errors are some sampling weaknesses. Since the data was collected through a cross-sectional distribution, we cannot explore long term effects of the college situations. Thus, longitudinal studies should trace the values of students during different stages of their educational experience.

The lack of a random sample also presents some problems. A thorough examination of the sample reveals that the proportion of majors is not perfectly balanced. Specifically, social work majors are over sampled ($N=75/437$), while other majors are underrepresented. Along the same line, the sample is gathered from mostly lower-division students ($N=282/437$). Finally, there might be a selection bias

among the professors who were willing to participate in this study. That is, the professors who refused to distribute this survey in their classes might be against addressing multiculturalism issues. Conversely, those who allowed me to collect data in their classes could demonstrate a favorable predisposition to a multicultural education. Also the findings of this research may not accurately represent the student dynamics at different schools. That is, students from other geographic, economic, and political regions might have very different attitudes. For example, these findings may not accurately characterize the practices and attitudes of students at the City University of New York, or Stanford.

Another sort limitation is interest to survey research. That is, the responses to written documents may not accurately reflect student's perceptions. Students might falsify their responses due to perceived desirable responses or close-ended responses may not elaborate possible perceptions. That is, attitudes might fluctuate from setting to setting and these responses might only indicate what people think when a survey is distributed.

In conclusion, it is hoped that the findings of this research will enhance race relations in general and a multicultural education in specific. We can know that racial resentment and racist stereotypes are issues to tackle for progressive teachers. Further, we can see that a multicultural education reduces those factors and produces positive attitudes toward multiculturalism. This is a window of opportunity for educators to find ways to decrease the resentment of White students and create pro-multiculturalism attitudes among the students.

These changes might lead to a better society since those who have been touched by such an educational experience might be less likely to reinforce racial inequality. That is, people may be less prone to scapegoat minorities for American social ills, and American society might move toward a more egalitarian place. However, this research is not privy to the long-term effects of a multicultural education on college students who have graduated or left the college scene. But there remains hope that a multicultural education does shape students' attitudes in such a way as to improve race relations among those who are a part of this society.

APPENDIX: SURVEY

This survey is examining the attitudes of college students. In completing this survey, all names will be kept confidential, and aggregated results will be available upon request.

These items ask you to think about your opinion on a variety of topics. Please indicate whether or not you strongly agree=1, agree=2, aren't sure=3, disagree=4 or strongly disagree=5 with each statement. Circle the number that most accurately corresponds to your response.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Respect for authority should be taught to all children.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Law and order should be strengthened in our society.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Students should give up their cultural practices and beliefs to conform to "mainstream" social values.	1	2	3	4	5
4. We have gone too far in pushing equal rights in this country.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I would like to see the gap between rich and poor shrink.	1	2	3	4	5
✓ 6. It is not really a big problem if some people have more life chances than others.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Government shouldn't guarantee jobs; each person should get ahead on his/her own hard work.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Anyone who works hard can succeed.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I pay attention to politics.	1	2	3	4	5
✓ 10. Minorities are generally lazy.	1	2	3	4	5
✓ 11. Minorities are mostly intelligent.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Minorities prefer to be supported by welfare.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Minorities are easy to get along with.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Discrimination keeps minorities from getting ahead.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Today's minorities have better living conditions than ever before.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
16. This country has not made progress toward achieving racial equality.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Minorities frequently see racism where it does not exist.	1	2	3	4	5
18. The students at this college are prejudiced against minority students.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I would be willing to pay higher taxes to offer more multicultural courses.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I want to spend more time reading books by minorities.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Over the years, the government has shown more attention to Blacks than they deserve.	1	2	3	4	5
✓ 22. I cannot stand when Blacks use affirmative action for their own benefits.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Minorities are too demanding when pushing for equal rights.	1	2	3	4	5
24. People of other races are basically taking benefits from people of my race.	1	2	3	4	5
✓ 25. As Blacks move ahead economically, more and more Whites fall behind.	1	2	3	4	5
26. People of my race have a fair opportunity to get ahead in life.	1	2	3	4	5
27. The more power minorities have on campus, the less power Whites have on campus.	1	2	3	4	5
✓ 28. Black students get more scholarships than White students do.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Teachers spend too much time looking at different cultures.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I am comfortable socializing with members of my own ethnic group.	1	2	3	4	5
31. I attend college because my parents make me go.	1	2	3	4	5
32. I attend MSU because my friends also attend(ed) MSU.	1	2	3	4	5
33. I attend college to get a good paying job.	1	2	3	4	5
34. I attend college because I want to explore more about my values.	1	2	3	4	5
35. I attend college because I want to party.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
36. It is important for me to complete a college degree in my lifetime.	1	2	3	4	5
37. When I graduate from college, I will enroll for a more advanced degree.	1	2	3	4	5
38. Since coming to this institution, I have developed close personal relationships with other students.	1	2	3	4	5
39. Most of my friends are liberal.	1	2	3	4	5
40. Most of my friends think college increases earning power.	1	2	3	4	5
41. Most of my professors are liberal.	1	2	3	4	5
42. Most of my professors want to influence politics.	1	2	3	4	5
43. Most of my professors use readings or materials on racial and/or gender related issues in courses.	1	2	3	4	5
44. Students in this university are treated like numbers.	1	2	3	4	5
45. University courses don't deal with important issues.	1	2	3	4	5
46. University administrators don't care how their decisions affect student life.	1	2	3	4	5
47. I really like this college.	1	2	3	4	5
48. I feel lost and alone much of the time on campus.	1	2	3	4	5
49. The materials in college courses overwhelm me.	1	2	3	4	5
50. My church has the only right way.	1	2	3	4	5
51. I think the world would be better off if everyone practiced my religion.	1	2	3	4	5
52. The Bible is the word of God and should be taken literally word for word.	1	2	3	4	5
53. In the last couple of years, my family's economic condition has been getting worse.	1	2	3	4	5
54. This college should have women's studies and/or Black studies majors.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
55. More content on women and minorities should be taught in required courses.	1	2	3	4	5
56. The perspectives of a wide range of ethnic groups should be included into the curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
57. I wish my college had more information or resources on minority issues.	1	2	3	4	5
58. The school staff should reflect ethnic and cultural diversity.	1	2	3	4	5
59. There should be special events or workshops to celebrate different cultures through programs such as "Diversity Day."	1	2	3	4	5
60. At this college there is not enough attention paid to learning about traditional American values.	1	2	3	4	5
61. Courses on a variety of ethnic groups encourage friction between these groups.	1	2	3	4	5
62. Multicultural education leads to lower academic standards.	1	2	3	4	5
63. Multicultural education should only be taught at home.	1	2	3	4	5
64. Learning about different cultures promotes a strong democracy.	1	2	3	4	5
65. Bilingual education hurts the verbal skills of immigrants.	1	2	3	4	5

Now I would like for you to respond to the following questions asking you about some of your own personal experiences and/or history. Please notice that the choices available to you are now different from the last section.

Circle the response that best reflects your experiences.

66. Compared to a few years ago, prejudice against minority groups has been
1. on the rise
 2. staying the same
 3. going down
67. At most of the places you have worked, what % of the employees were minorities?
1. 100-50%
 2. 49-25%
 3. 24-10%
 4. under 10%

68. At most of the schools you have attended, what % of the students were minorities?
1. 100-50%
 2. 49-25%
 3. 24-10%
 4. under 10%
69. At college, how often do you spend free time with members of other racial groups?
1. daily
 2. weekly
 3. monthly
 4. a few times a year
 5. once a year
 6. never or almost never
70. How often did your parents invite members of other racial groups into your house?
1. everyday
 2. several times a week
 3. once a week
 4. several times a month
 5. once a month
 6. several times a year
 7. once a year
 8. never or almost never
71. How often do you eat ethnic foods (e.g. Chinese, Korean, Mexican, Middle Eastern, etc.)?
1. everyday
 2. several times a week
 3. once a week
 4. several times a month
 5. once a month
 6. several times a year
 7. once a year
 8. never or almost never
72. As a child, how often did you travel outside of the region where you were living?
1. once a month or more
 2. every few months
 3. once or twice a year
 4. every few years
 5. never or almost never
73. How often do you go to the cities of Lexington and Louisville?
1. more than once a week
 2. once a week
 3. several times a month
 4. once a month
 5. several times a year
 6. once a year
 7. never or almost never

74. As a child, you mostly attended
1. public schools
 2. private schools
 3. home schooling
75. What is your classification at MSU?
1. Freshman (0-29 hours)
 2. Sophomore (30-59 hours)
 3. Junior (60-89 hours)
 4. Senior (90 and above)
 5. Graduate
76. How many hours per week do you normally spend on studying and doing homework?
1. none
 2. 1-5 hours
 3. 6-10 hours
 4. 11-15 hours
 5. 16-20 hours
 6. more than 20hours
77. How often do you discuss racial and ethnic minority issues outside of classroom?
1. everyday
 2. several times a week
 3. once a week
 4. several times a month
 5. once a month
 6. several times a year
 7. once a year
 8. never or almost never
78. How often do you socialize with friends?
1. everyday
 2. several times a week
 3. once a week
 4. several times a month
 5. once a month
 6. several times a year
 7. once a year
 8. never or almost never
79. How often do you drink alcohol?
1. everyday
 2. several times a week
 3. once a week
 4. several times a month
 5. once a month
 6. several times a year
 7. once a year
 8. never or almost never

80. Do you live

1. on campus (residential dorm)
2. on campus (not in a dorm)
3. off campus with family (e.g. parents, spouse, children, cousins)
4. off campus with friend(s) or partner(s)
5. off campus, by myself

81. How many total semesters have you ever spent living in a college dorm including this semester?

1. never
2. 1 semester
3. 2 semester
4. 3 semesters or more

82. Please identify your race/ethnicity.

1. White
2. African American
3. Asian American
4. Hispanic American
5. Native American
6. biracial/multiracial
7. Other _____

✓ 83. Which of the following best describes the area where you grew up?

1. center city of a large metropolitan area
2. suburb of a large metropolitan area
3. mid size metropolitan area (50,000-100,000)
4. small town (20,001-50,000)
5. rural area

84. What is your present marital status?

1. married
2. cohabiting
3. divorced, not cohabiting
4. single, never married
5. widowed
6. other, please specify _____

85. How strong is your connection to any church?

1. non existent
2. mild
3. strong
4. very strong

86. How often do you attend religious services?

1. every day
2. several times a week
3. once a week
4. several times a month
5. once a month
6. several times a year
7. once a year
8. never or almost never

87. In your daily life, how often does religion provide you with guidance?

1. everyday
2. several times a week
3. once a week
4. several times a month
5. once a month
6. several times a year
7. once a year
8. never or almost never

88. Please identify your party preference.

1. strong Democrat
2. weak Democrat
3. Independent
4. weak Republican
5. strong Republican
6. other

89. What is your political ideology?

1. far left
2. strong liberal
3. moderate liberal
4. middle of the road
5. moderate conservative
6. strong conservative
7. far right

90. Roughly, in 1997, what was your family's total income? (if you primarily depended on parents, what was your parent(s)' total family income?)

1. under \$5,000
2. \$5,001-\$10,000
3. \$10,001-\$15,000
4. \$15,001-\$20,000
5. \$20,001-\$25,000
6. \$25,001-\$30,000
7. \$30,001-\$35,000
8. \$35,001-\$40,000
9. \$40,001-\$45,000
10. \$45,001-\$50,000
11. \$50,001 and above

91. What social class do you classify yourself as?

1. Upper class
2. Middle class
3. Working class
4. Lower class

92. What is your parent's education?

	Mother	Father
Middle school or less	1	1
Some high school	2	2
High school graduate	3	3
Postsecondary school other than college (e.g. vocational school)	4	4
Some college	5	5
College degree	6	6
Some graduate school	7	7
Graduate/Professional degree (e.g. Law, Medicine)	8	8

Please circle your gender.

93. My gender is

Male Female

Now I would like for you to indicate whether or not you have had any of the following experiences. All that is required here is a simple yes or no. Please circle the appropriate response.

94. Has anybody in your immediate family married a person of a different racial group? Yes No
95. Have you dated a person of a different racial group? Yes No
96. Have you ever lived in or traveled to any countries outside of the U.S.? Yes No
97. If yes, please specify where. _____
98. At college(s), did you take any minority or gender related courses such as American Minority Relations, Appalachian Studies, Women's studies? Yes No
99. Have you enrolled in foreign language courses? Yes No
100. Have you participated in a study abroad program? Yes No
101. Please indicate if you have ever volunteered for these activities.
- | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|----|
| Tutoring other students | Yes | No |
| Cleaning on campus | Yes | No |
| Homeless shelter | Yes | No |
| Nursing home | Yes | No |
| Others | Yes | No |

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| 102. During this semester, do you have an on-campus job? | Yes | No |
| 103. Have you ever belonged to a fraternity or a sorority? | Yes | No |
| 104. Do you consider yourself Appalachian? | Yes | No |
| 105. Are you a born-again Christian? | Yes | No |

These are some brief questions that require only a word or two or perhaps a number. Please write down the appropriate word(s) or number(s).

106. How many of your good friends are of different racial groups? _____
107. How many minority professors have been your instructors? _____
108. What is your major? _____
109. What is your college GPA?
(if this is your first semester, what is your high school GPA?) _____
110. In this semester, how many hours per week on the average do you work
for pay off-campus? _____
111. How many hours a day do you usually watch TV? _____
112. How old are you? _____
113. When you were growing up, where did you spend most of your time?
- county _____
- state _____
- country _____

114. How many school-age children/stepchildren have you had living with you in the past 5 years?
- _____

Finally, circle the number that most accurately corresponds to your response.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
115. Discrimination keeps homosexuals/gays from getting ahead.	1	2	3	4	5
116. Homosexuals/gays are too demanding when pushing for equal rights.	1	2	3	4	5
117. Teachers spend too much time looking at gay and lesbian issues.	1	2	3	4	5
118. I consider myself to be gay. (e.g. homosexual/gay/lesbian, bisexual)	1	2	3	4	5

THANK YOU!!!

NOTES

1. Since some parts of the discussion of symbolic racism can be blended into other theoretical models, thus, this paper will focus on the most distinctive argument of symbolic racism. In making such a choice, this paper will emphasize that symbolic racists deny the continuation of racism as they assume that society treats all races equally. Or in other words, they consider that racial minorities foolish since they are fighting against something that does not exist. One might argue that I ignore the traditional values as a part of element shaping symbolic racism. Sears (1988) defines symbolic racism is blending of anti-affect and traditional values. However, in this paper, the violation of values such as individualism is not considered to measure symbolic racism. Because as Bobo argues, American values are always used to rationalize racism or prejudice, therefore, it is not a new concept nor particular to only symbolic racism. Therefore, the consideration of traditional values in the argument of symbolic racism is not taken into account.
2. It is found that some parts of the definition described by Kinder and Sanders (1997) sounds similar to that of group conflict theory. First of all, Kinder and Sanders discuss that racial resentment is different from traditional biological racism. That is also discussed by group conflict. Therefore, the rejecting biological racism applies to the both theories. Second, racial resentment discusses "indignation" that is produced by the "sense" that blacks are "getting and taking more than their fair share." This is almost the same discussion that group conflict theory makes by changing the word from "indignation" to "fear" or "threat." Therefore, both racial resentment and group conflict deal with the rejection of biological racism and also feeling of hostility. Racial resentment does not necessary originate from the combination of anti-affect and violation of values. That is, people can be racially resentful toward racial minority groups without recognizing violation of values or anti-affect. Simply people can be resentful against minority groups when they face the scarcity over resources with minority groups. Therefore, racial resentment seems not be able to stand by itself independently. Since the elements are shared by both racial resentment advocates and group conflict theorists, this paper decides to discuss racial resentment with group conflict.
3. In this discussion, there can be a problem of time ordering in this relationship. Students who take multiculturalism classes might have already embraced multiculturalism, so taking minority classes itself might have little effect in itself.

REFERENCES

- used [Alvarez, R. Michael and John Brehm. 1997. "Are Americans Ambivalent Towards Racial Policies?" *American Journal of Political Science* 41(2): 345-374.
- Astin, Alexander W. 1993. *What Matters in College?: Four Critical Years Revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Banks, James A. 1994. *Multicultural Education: Theory and Practice*. 3d ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bloom, Allan. 1987. *The Closing of the American Mind*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Blumer, Herbert. 1958a. "Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position." *Pacific Sociological Review* 1: 3-7.
- 1958b. "Research on Racial Relations: United States of America." *International Bulletin of Social Science*: 403-447.
- Bobo, Lawrence. 1983. "Whites' Opposition to Busing: Symbolic Racism or Realistic Group Conflict?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 45(6): 1196-1210.
- 1988a. "Attitudes toward the Black Political Movement: Trends, Meaning, and Effects on Racial Policy Preferences." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 51(4): 287-302.
- 1988b. "Group Conflict, Prejudice, and the Paradox of Contemporary Racial Attitudes." Pp. 85-114 in *Eliminating Racism: Profiles in Controversy*, edited by P. A. Katz and D. A. Taylor. New York: Plenum.
- Bobo, Lawrence and Vincent L. Hutchings. 1996. "Perceptions of Racial Group Competition: Extending Blumer's Theory of Group Position to a Multiracial Social Context." *American Sociological Review* 61: 951-972.
- Bobo, Lawrence and James R. Kluegel. 1993. "Opposition to Race-Targeting: Self-Interest, Stratification Ideology, or Racial Attitudes?" *American Sociological Review* 58: 443-464.
- Bobo, Lawrence and Camille Zubrinsky. 1996. "Attitudes on Residential Integration: Perceived Status Differences, Mere In-Group Preference, or Racial Prejudice?" *Social Forces* 74(3): 883-909.

- Burris, Val and Sara Diamond. 1991. "Academic Freedom, Conspicuous Benevolence, and the National Association of Scholars." *Critical Sociology* 18(3): 125-142.
- Case, Charles E. and Andrew M. Creeley. 1990. "Attitudes Toward Racial Equality." *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations* 16(1): 67-94.
- Chavez, Lydia. 1998. *The Color Blind: The Campaign to End Affirmative Action*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- County and City Data Book. <http://fisher.lib.Virginia.EDU/cgi-local/ccdbbin/countysort2.cgi>
- Davine, V. R. and D. B. Bills. 1992. "Changing Attitudes toward Race-Related Issues: Is a Sociological Perspective Effective? Paper presented at annual meeting of American Sociological Association, Pittsburgh, August.
- Dovidio, John F. and Samuel L. Gaertner. 1998. "On the Nature of Contemporary Prejudice: The Causes, Consequences, and Challenges of Aversion racism." Pp. 3-32 in *Confronting Racism: The Problem and the Response*, edited by Jennifer L. Eberhardt and Susan T. Fiske. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Easterlin, Richard A. and Eileen M. Crimmins. 1991. "Private Materialism, Personal Fulfillment, Family Life, and Public Interest: The Nature, Effects and Causes of Recent Changes in the Values of American Youth." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 55: 499-533.
- Economics and Statistics Administration. 1994. Local Area Personal Income 1969-92. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara. 1989. "The Discovering of the Working Class." Pp. 97-143 in *Fear of Falling: The Inner Life of the Middle Class*. Harper Perennial.
- Ellison, Christopher G. and Daniel A. Powers. 1994. "The Contact Hypothesis and Racial Attitudes among Black Americans." *Social Science Quarterly* 75(2): 385-400.
- Facts on File. 1998. *Facts on File: Weekly World News Digest with Cumulative Index* 58(30000): 373. NY: Facts on File News Services, Primedia Company.
- Freundreis, John. and Raymond Tatalovich. 1997. "Who Supports English-Only Language Laws? Evidence from the 1992 National Election Study." *Social Science Quarterly* 78(2): 354-368.

- Gilens, Martin. 1995. "Racial Attitudes and Opposition to Welfare." *The Journal of Politics* 57(4): 994-1014.
- Giroux, Henry A. 1994. "Insurgent Multiculturalism and the Promise of Pedagogy." Pp. 325-343 in *Multiculturalism: A Critical Reader*, edited by David Theo Goldberg. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Glover, Rebecca J. 1991. "Using Moral and Epistemological Reasoning as Predictors of Prejudice." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 134(5): 633-640.
- Goldberg, David Theo. 1994. "Introduction: Multicultural Conditions." Pp. 1-41 in *Multiculturalism: A Critical Reader*, edited by David Theo Goldberg. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Higham, John. 1993. "Multiculturalism and Universalism: A History and Critique." *American Quarterly* 45(2): 195-219.
- Hirsch, Jr., E.D. 1987. *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Jayne, Edward. 1991. "Academic Jeremiad: The Neoconservative View of American Higher Education." *Change* 23(3): 30-41.
- Kinder, Donald R. and Lynn M. Sanders. 1996. *Divided by Color: Racial Politics and Democratic Ideals*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kinder, Donald R. and David O. Sears. 1981. "Prejudice and Politics: Symbolic Racism versus Racial Threats to the Good Life." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 40(3): 414-431.
- Kirkpatrick, Lee A. 1993. "Fundamentalism, Christian Orthodoxy, and Intrinsic Religious Orientation as Predictors of Discriminatory Attitudes." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 32(3): 256-268.
- Klotter, James. 1985. "The Black South and White Appalachia." Pp. 51-67 in *Blacks in Appalachia*, edited by William H. Turner and Edward J. Cabbell. Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky.
- La Belle, Thomas J. and Christopher R. Ward. 1996. "The Rise of Multiculturalism." Pp. 51-66 in *Ethnic Studies and Multiculturalism*, edited by Thomas J. La Belle and Christopher R. Ward. State University of New York.

Layman, Geoffrey C. 1997. "Religion and Political Behavior in the United States: The Impact of Beliefs, Affiliations, and Commitment from 1980 to 1994." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 61(2): 288-316.

Levine, Lawrence W. 1996a. New York Times, August 21, 1996.

Levine, Lawrence. 1996b. *The Opening of the American Mind: Canons, Culture, and History*. Boston: Bacon Press.

Levine, Arthur and Jeanette S. Cureton. 1998. *When Hope and Fear Collide: A Portrait of Today's College Student*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

used [Link, Michael W. and Robert W. Oldendick, 1996. "Social Construction and White Attitudes toward Equal Opportunity and Multiculturalism." *The Journal of Politics* 58(1): 149-168.

Luttrell, Wendy. 1997. *Schoolsmart and Motherwise: Working-Class Women's Identity and Schooling*. New York: Routledge.

Martire, G. and R. Clark. 1982. *Antisemitism in the United States*. New York: Praeger.

Mendleson, Jack L, Allen L. Bures, Donald L. Champion and J. Kendall Lott. 1997. "Preliminary Development of the Intercultural Tolerance Scale." *Psychological Reports* 80: 867-876.

Milem, Jeffry F. 1994. "College, Students, and Racial Understanding." *Thought and Action* 9(2): 51-92.

Miville, L. Maria, Bekele Molla and William E. Sedlacek. 1992. "Attitudes of Tolerance for Diversity Among College Students." *Journal of The Freshman Year Experience* 4(1): 95-110.

Muir, Donal E. 1991. "'White' Fraternity and Sorority Attitudes toward 'Blacks' on a Deep-South Campus." *Sociological Spectrum* 11(1): 93-103.

Newswanger, James F. 1996. "The Relationship Between White Racial Identity Attitudes and the Experience of Having a Black College Roommate." *Journal of College Student Development* 37(5): 536-542.

Oliver, Melvin L. and Thomas M. Shapiro. 1997. "A Story of Two Nations: Race and Wealth." Pp. 91-126 in *Black Wealth/White Wealth: A New Perspective on Racial Inequality*. New York: Routledge.

- Pascarella, Ernest T., Marcia Edison, Amaury Nora, Linda Serra Hagedorn, and Patric T. Terenzin. 1996. "Influences on Students' Openness to Diversity and Challenge in the First Year of College." *Journal of Higher Education* 67(2): 174-95.
- Patchen, Martin. 1999. *Diversity and Unity: Relations between Racial and Ethnic Groups*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.
- Phillips, Anne. 1997. "Why Worry about Multiculturalism?" *Dissent* 44(1): 57-63.
- Platt, Anthony M. 1992. "Defenders of the Canon: What's behind the Attack on Multiculturalism." *Social Justice* 19(2): 122-140.
- Powers, Daniel A. and Christopher G. Ellison. 1995. "Interracial Contact and Black Racial Attitudes: The Contact Hypothesis and Selectivity Bias." *Social Forces* 74(1): 205-226.
- Qualls, R. Christopher, Mary B. Cox and Terra L. Schehr. 1992. "Racial Attitudes on Campus: Are There Gender Differences?" *Journal of College Student Development* 33: 524-529.
- Quillian, Lincoln. 1996. "Group Threat and Regional Change in Attitudes toward African-Americans." *American Journal of Sociology* 3: 816-860.
- Quinley, H. E. and C. Y. Glock. 1979. *Anti-Semitism in America*. New York: The Free Press.
- Raitz, Karl B. and Richard Ulack with Thomas R. Leinback. 1984. *Appalachia: A Regional Geography: Land, People, and Development*. Boulder: West view Press.
- Ransford, H. Edward. 1972. "Blue Collar Anger: Reactions to Student and Black Protest." *American Sociological Review* 37(3): 333-346.
- Ravitch, Diane. 1990. "Multiculturalism: E Pluribus Plures." *American Scholar* 59(3): 337-354.
- Rubin, Lillian B. 1994. *Families on the Fault Line: America's Working Class Speaks About the Family, the Economy, Race, and Ethnicity*. Harper Perennial.
- Rural Development Working Group. 1995. *Socio-Economic Atlas of Kentucky*. Edited by Scott A. Samson. College of Agriculture, University of Kentucky.

Schlesinger, Jr., Arthur M. 1992. *The Disuniting of America*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Schuman, Howard, Charlotte Steeh, Lawrence Bobo and Maria Krysan. 1997. *Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations*. Rev. ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

☞ Sears, David O. 1988. "Symbolic Racism." Pp. 53-84 in *Eliminating Racism: Profiles in Controversy*, edited by P. A. Katz and D. A. Taylor. New York: Plenum.

used [Sears, David O., Colette van Laar, Mary Carrillo and Rick Kosterman. 1997. "Is it Really Racism?: The Origins of White Americans' Opposition to Race-Targeted Policies." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 61(1): 16-53.

Secret, Philip E., James B. Johnson and Andrey W. Forrest. 1990. "The Impact of Religiosity on Political Participation and Membership in Voluntary Associations among Black and White Americans." *American Journal of Black Studies* 21: 87-102.

used [Seltzer, Richard, Michael Frazier and Irelene Ricks. 1995. "Multiculturalism, Race, and Education." *Journal of Negro Education* 64(2): 124-140.

☞ Sidanius, Jim, Erik Devereux and Felicia Pratto. 1991. "A Comparison of Symbolic Racism Theory and Social Dominance Theory as Explanations for Racial Policy Attitudes." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 12(3): 377-395.

Sigelman, Lee and Steven A. Tuch. 1997. "Metastereotypes' Blacks' Perceptions of Whites' Stereotypes of Blacks." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 61: 87-101.

Sigelman, Lee and Susan Welch. 1993. "The Contact Hypothesis revisited: Black-White Interaction and Positive Racial Attitude." *Social Forces* 71(3): 781-795.

Smith, A. W. 1981. "Racial Tolerance as a Function of Group Position." *American Sociological Review* 46: 558-573.

Smith, Christopher B. 1994. "Back and to the Future: The Intergroup Contact Hypothesis revisited." *Sociological Inquiry* 64(4): 438-455.

Smith, Kevin B. and Robert A. Bylund. 1983. "Cognitive Maps of Class, Racial, and Appalachian Inequalities among Rural Appalachians." *Rural Sociology* 48(2): 253-270.

Springer, Leonard, Betsy Palmer, Patrick T. Terenzin, Ernest T. Pascarella and Amaury Nora. 1996. "Attitudes toward Campus Diversity: Participation in a Racial or Cultural Awareness Workshop." *The Review of Higher Education* 20(1): 53-68.

Stack, Steven. 1997. "Women's Opposition to Race-Targeted Interventions." *Sex Roles* 36: 543-550.

Stephan, W. G. and C. W. Stephan. 1984. "The Role of Ignorance in Intergroup Relations." in *Group in Contact*, edited by N. Miller and M. B. Brewer. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Sutherland, Sharon Lynn. 1981. *Patterns of Belief and Action: Measurement of Student Political Activism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Takaki, Ronald 1993a. *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

-----1993b. "Multiculturalism: Battleground or Meeting Ground?" *The Annals of the American Academy of Politics* 530: 109-121.

Taylor, Marylee C. 1998. "How Attitudes Vary with the Racial Composition of Local Populations: Numbers Count." *American Sociological Review* 63: 512-535.

Taylor, Donald M. and Wallace E. Lambert. 1996. "The Meaning of Multiculturalism in a Culturally Diverse Urban American Area." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 136(6): 727-740.

Tuch, Steven A. and Michael Hughes. 1996. "Whites' Racial Policy Attitudes." *Social Science Quarterly* 77(4): 723-745.

Turner, William H. 1985. "Introduction." Pp. xvii-xxiii in *Blacks in Appalachia*, edited by William H. Turner and Edward J. Cabbell. Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky.

Weigel, Russell H. and Paul W. Howes. 1985. "Conceptions of Racial Prejudice: Symbolic Racism Reconsidered." *Journal of Social Issues* 41(3): 117-138.

Wood, Peter B. and Michele Chesser. 1994. "Black Stereotyping in a University Population." *Sociological Focus* 27(1): 17-34.

Wrights, Stephen C., Arthur Aron, Tracy McLaughlin-Volpe, and Stacy A. Ropp.
1997. "The Extended Contact Effect: Knowledge of Cross-Group Friendship
and Prejudice." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 73(1): 73-90.